

COAST GUARD.  
To be captains.

Fletcher W. Brown.  
Henry Coyle.  
Robert Donohue.  
Frank J. Gorman.  
Lloyd V. Kleihorn.  
Gordon W. MacLane.  
Earl G. Rose.  
Edward H. Smith.  
Elmer F. Stone.  
Carl C. von Paulsen.  
John E. Whitbeck.

POSTMASTERS.  
ARIZONA.

Leonard C. Parke, Chandler.  
Andrew R. Tipton, Clarkdale.  
Nancy M. Dermont, Metcalf.

CALIFORNIA.

Charles H. Coffey, jr., Gonzales.  
George A. Debenedetti, Half Moon Bay.  
Winifred M. Whitney, Oceanside.  
Calla Winger, Orcutt.  
William J. Martin, Salinas.  
Alfred Gourdiere, Torrance.  
Florence Stone, Tustin.  
Robert W. Walker, Vallejo.

IDAHO.

Arthur H. Potsch, Genesee.

MONTANA.

Charles W. Allison, Bainville.  
George C. Core, Choteau.  
Andrew N. Smith, Columbia Falls.  
Jacob Z. Bruegger, Culbertson.  
Avory W. Dehnert, Denton.  
Mathew H. Casey, Kremlin.  
George H. Wood, Malta.  
Charles A. Pennell, Manhattan.  
John W. Lister, Missoula.  
Wade J. Hubbell, Poplar.  
Frances W. Tarwater, Saco.  
Burton S. Adams, Sidney.  
Claude C. Alexander, Stanford.  
William Fraser, Three Forks.  
Adolph B. Horstman, Whitefish.  
Thomas E. Devore, Whitehall.

NEW JERSEY.

George Coleman, Delanco.  
Ida H. Collom, Pemberton.

OHIO.

Jerome H. C. Goodhart, Brewster.  
Harry C. Parrett, Continental.  
Charles E. Cramer, Fredericksburg.  
Don B. Stanley, Lowell.  
George H. Mounts, Salem.  
William R. Hatfield, West Milton.

VIRGINIA.

William H. Rixey, Rosslyn.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, May 10, 1920.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of law and order, peace and equity, justice and mercy, truth and purity, whose love reaches the farthest star in the vast universe and would enter in and possess the most forlorn and lonely soul, control our minds, direct our ways, and bring us with all the world in harmony with the eternal plans Thou hast ordained. Under the divine leadership of Thy son, Jesus of Nazareth. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, May 8, 1920, was read and approved.

### SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Hon. PATRICK HENRY DREWRY, who comes from the old Lexington district in Virginia, is present and wishes to qualify. His credentials are with the Clerk.

Thereupon Mr. DREWRY, accompanied by Mr. Flood, appeared before the bar of the House, and the Speaker administered the oath of office to Mr. DREWRY.

### SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13870, the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the sundry civil bill. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] will take the chair.

Thereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13870, the sundry civil bill, with Mr. ANDERSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the sundry civil bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13870) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insane of Alaska: For care and custody of persons legally adjudged insane in Alaska, including transportation and other expenses, \$115,000: *Provided*, That authority is granted to the Secretary of the Interior to pay from this appropriation to the Sanitarium Co. of Portland, Oreg., not to exceed \$520 per capita per annum for the care and maintenance of Alaskan insane patients during the fiscal year 1921.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington moves to strike out the last word. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I was in hopes that some provision would be made and carried in this bill in regard to the insane from Alaska, to provide for these insane to be returned to Alaska, or, if citizens of Alaska and found in the States of the Pacific Northwest, that they shall be sent to the sanitarium at Portland. Legislation is asked for to cure that condition. I hope that the time will come when we shall have a sanitarium for the insane in Alaska.

As it is now, a citizen of Alaska found insane in the States can not be sent to the Morningside Asylum at Portland for the reason that that citizen has not been adjudged insane in Alaska. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Education in Alaska: To enable the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion and under his direction, to provide for the education and support of the Eskimos, Aleuts, Indians, and other natives of Alaska; erection, repair, and rental of school buildings; textbooks and industrial apparatus; pay and necessary traveling expenses of superintendents, teachers, physicians, and other employees; and all other necessary miscellaneous expenses which are not included under the above special heads, \$275,000: *Provided*, That no person employed hereunder as special agent or inspector, or to perform any special or unusual duty in connection herewith shall receive as compensation exceeding \$200 per month, in addition to actual traveling expenses and per diem not exceeding \$4 in lieu of subsistence, when absent on duty from his designated and actual post of duty: *Provided further*, That of said sum not exceeding \$7,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the chairman of the committee, in connection with this paragraph in regard to education in Alaska, whether or not the subject of education could not be brought closer home, say here in the District of Columbia, and if the chairman at this time would permit us, without raising a point of order against it, to offer an amendment to this paragraph to provide for what is known as the teachers' bonus of \$500 for the teachers of the District of Columbia? Many of the teachers here get less than \$900 per year salary.

Mr. GOOD. Of course, that would not be germane to this item. The gentleman understands that this education that is carried on by the Department of the Interior in Alaska is for the native children.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I know it is subject to a point of order; but the urgency of the matter is so great, the need of it is so

great just now to save the schools of the District of Columbia, that I thought possibly the chairman would permit it.

Mr. GOOD. I think the gentleman will agree that the committee having charge of the District of Columbia appropriation bill went a long way, so far as increasing the pay of the teachers is concerned.

Mr. BLANTON. They had a long amendment, but after we passed it it did not amount to much increase for the teachers.

Mr. GOOD. I think it did. It requires the additional expenditure of about \$750,000 a year.

Mr. BLANTON. The teachers are urging Congress right now for some immediate action, claiming that they have no means whatever to carry them through the summer months. I heard a distinguished educator in the House the other day say, "Oh, let them go to work and farm themselves out during the summer months in useful work."

I want to say right now that when a teacher spends nine months of the year in the schoolroom she is entitled to a little recreation in the summer time. If the teachers are going to be kept fit to teach the youth of the land during the rest of the year, they ought to have some time off in the summer.

Mr. GOOD. I could not agree to an amendment of that kind; that is not germane.

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman in favor of it?

Mr. GOOD. I have been very sympathetic in my attitude toward the teachers' pay. I think the pay of the ordinary clerk in Washington is in most cases a good deal higher at present than the pay of school-teachers.

Mr. BLANTON. The pay of the idle negro janitor in a department in Washington is much higher to-day than that of the highly trained white lady school-teacher.

Mr. GOOD. In the subcommittee in charge of the deficiency bill—

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on this discussion on the paragraph.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is not against education, is he?

Mr. SANFORD. Of course not; but I make the point of order against this discussion.

Mr. BLANTON. Let it be charged, then, against the gentleman that he is opposed even to a discussion of the subject. Let the teachers get after him.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Reindeer for Alaska: For support of reindeer stations in Alaska and instruction of Alaskan natives in the care and management of reindeer, \$6,400: *Provided*, That the Commissioner of Education is authorized to sell such of the male reindeer belonging to the Government as he may deem advisable and to use the proceeds in the purchase of female reindeer belonging to missions and in the distribution of reindeer to natives in those portions of Alaska in which reindeer have not yet been placed and which are adapted to the reindeer industry.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment on page 108, line 8. After the word "industry," add a new paragraph, "That there shall be paid to each teacher in the District of Columbia a bonus of \$500 for the school year of 1919-20."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 108, line 8, after the word "industry," insert a new paragraph, to read as follows: "That there shall be paid to each teacher in the District of Columbia a bonus of \$500 for the school year of 1919-20."

Mr. GOOD. To that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, in the paragraph preceding this one to which I offered the amendment we provide for education in Alaska to the amount \$275,000. We do not stop there. That is all right, however, and I am in favor of every dollar of it. You will never find me, as long as I am in the House, voting to reduce appropriations for education of the people one single dollar, because I am in favor of educating them to a blue-sky limit.

But, I say, we do not stop there; we go on further, and in the paragraph preceding this we provide that the Commissioner of Education shall expend \$6,400 on the management of reindeer in Alaska, and so forth. Now, I want to ask my colleague if there is a single reason on the face of the earth that we can offer for not paying the teachers of the District of Columbia this little, measly amount of a \$500 bonus when many of them are now getting less than \$900 per year?

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman is asking me, I will tell the gentleman what I think about it.

Mr. BLANTON. I will yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I think in the past the teachers in the District of Columbia were the worst paid teachers in the United States. I always favored good compensation for the teachers.

They all know that I have, not only here but all over the United States.

Mr. BLANTON. I hope the gentleman will not take up all my time.

Mr. MADDEN. I will get the gentleman more time. I favored the pension for them, which they were justly entitled to. I favored the increased compensation provided for in the District bill, amounting to 50 or 100 per cent. They have got that. They come now and ask for a bonus of \$500. I am against that; I think there is a limit beyond which we ought not to go.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois to the fact that there is in the District now a young lady whom I know who is highly educated, who taught school in the high schools of Texas, one of the best teachers that you will find anywhere in the country, who is teaching in your District schools here right now on a salary of less than \$100 a month. Why should she do it? She has got to stop. She told me the other day that she absolutely could not afford to do it; that she will have to resign her position.

Mr. HICKEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. HICKEY. What salary did this young lady receive in Texas?

Mr. BLANTON. I think she received more than \$100 per month, but she came to the District of Columbia, like other people come, for the advantages that a young person can receive here in an educational way.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. If she is such a good teacher, is there anything to keep her from going down to Texas and getting \$400 or \$500 or \$2,000 increase?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes; I will tell you what is the matter; you are trying to force every teacher in the District of Columbia to join the trade-union, which would be an everlasting disgrace to their profession; and when you do it you will not find a man here who will stand up and vote against their demands. Every one of you who talks against it now will be found jumping up here and voting for everything that you are called upon to do in the name of unions.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. GOOD. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that next year the lowest-grade teacher in the District of Columbia will receive \$1,200 and a bonus of \$240?

Mr. BLANTON. But what are you going to do about this year and the summer months in front of them, when they have got to live, just like you and I? They can not pay their debts on promises for next year. They can not pay for their meat and bread and board and lodging on legislative promises of what is to come next year.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman's amendment does not take care of this year.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes, it does. It is for the school year of 1919-20. They will get it immediately. What you want to do is to force them to join the union, and then when Samuel Gompers comes up here and puts Morrison in the gallery and his cohorts around here call on you, you are going to give them what they want, and you know it. Why don't you act without being compelled to act?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane and is not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that the effect of the amendment is to increase salaries not fixed by law, and the Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. GANDY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill when the item which was passed over Saturday is going to be taken up?

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman means the item with reference to the reclamation project?

Mr. GANDY. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. I have not had time to examine into the merits of the matter yet.

Mr. GANDY. It will be taken up at the end of the bill?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; at the end of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

National Park Service: Director, \$4,500; assistant director, \$2,500; chief clerk, \$2,000; editor, \$2,000; draftsman, \$1,800; junior draftsman, \$1,440; accountant, \$1,800; clerks—3 of class 3, 2 of class 2, 1 of class 1, 1 \$1,020, 2 at \$900 each; messenger, \$600; in all, for park service in the District of Columbia, \$28,260.

Mr. HARRELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I should like to ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr.



Good] what is the meaning of the terms, clerks of class 4, clerks of class 3, clerks of class 2, and clerks of class 1?

Mr. GOOD. A clerk of class 4 receives a salary of \$1,800, a clerk of class 3 receives a salary of \$1,600, a clerk of class 2 receives a salary of \$1,400, and a clerk of class 1 receives a salary of \$1,200. Without other specifications, appropriations are made for their employment under the classification law.

Mr. HARRELD. Is that provided in the bill?

Mr. GOOD. That is provided in the general law in regard to classification.

Mr. HARRELD. I notice that there was expended for this purpose in 1920, \$22,220, and we propose now to increase it to \$28,260, and to provide for three extra clerks, one of class 3, one of class 2, and one of class 1. I should like to know what is the necessity for increasing this clerical force at this time, when we are trying to economize?

Mr. GOOD. We gave four extra clerks—that is, a junior draftsman, an accountant, one clerk of class 3, and one clerk of class 1.

The director of the park service felt that there was no place where more economy could be effected than by giving them the clerical force here that was required to look after the national parks. They were having some trouble with regard to their accounts. They get in accounts from all of the national parks, and here is an appropriation of about \$1,000,000 a year for the national parks.

Mr. HARRELD. Approximately \$904,000.

Mr. GOOD. It is approximately \$1,000,000 a year. The committee felt that with an appropriation of that kind we could not be too careful in the matter of accounts. The director thought that greater economies would be effected if they could keep their work current, if they could keep up their affairs in a businesslike way; that at the present time their force was so small that they were not able to keep their work current and to look after the national forests.

Mr. HARRELD. I should like to point out to the gentleman that the increase in the appropriations is only \$157,000 more than it was last year.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; I have stated to the gentleman just what the situation is. I could state more if it would not show how stingy we have been in this regard and had made it necessary for the director to pay some of the clerks out of his own pocket.

Mr. HARRELD. Does it take three more clerks to handle \$157,000 more than they had last year?

Mr. GOOD. No; I have said to the gentleman that the director states that their work is way behind now. I have tried to explain the situation.

Mr. HARRELD. I should like to ask about this editor at \$2,000. I withdraw my pro forma amendment and make a point of order against the item "editor, \$2,000."

Mr. GOOD. The point of order comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn. Of course debate having taken place on the pro forma amendment, a point of order would not lie against the paragraph.

Mr. HARRELD. Then I move to strike out in line 21, page 108, the item "editor, \$2,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Harreld: Page 108, line 21, strike out after the figures "\$2,000" where they occur the first time the words and figures "editor, \$2,000."

Mr. HARRELD. Now, Mr. Chairman, at this time, when we have such a scarcity of print paper, I can not see the use of this expense of printing these advertisements, or whatever they are, affecting the national parks. I think it is time we began a program of real economy, appropriating only that which is necessary. I noticed the other day the statement that in 1916 we had a per capita national revenue of \$7.16, and that the per capita expenditures for that year were \$7.07. That year we were receiving more than we were expending. In the year 1919, the latest figures available, the per capita revenue was \$48.10 and the per capita expenditures were \$139.80, almost four times what our receipts were. It seems to me that this is a good place to begin economy.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the total revenue from the national parks last year amounted to \$186,000. The revenue up to the time of the hearings for this year was \$198,000, and it is estimated that the revenue for next year derived from people who visit the parks and from certain of the concessions in the parks alone will amount to \$300,000. The only way the revenue can be increased is to advertise and make known the beauties of the parks.

This item has been carried a long time. It is not a new item. The editor prepares all the literature with regard to the parks, and it seems to me the item should remain in the bill. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter the Secretary of the Interior in his administration of the National Park Service is authorized, in his discretion, to accept patented lands, rights of way over patented lands or other lands, buildings, or other property within the various national parks and national monuments, and moneys which may be donated for the purposes of the national park and monument system.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This item gives the Secretary authority to accept lands for park purposes. I will ask the gentleman if there was any information before the committee concerning the possible acceptance of some of the big-tree lands? There has been a good deal of advertising, and statements have been made in the newspapers, and it is interesting to know.

Mr. GOOD. A few years ago in the Yosemite Park there were private holdings which the director of the park service desired to secure, in order to prevent persons from going into the park and maintaining on such holdings certain establishments there that might interfere very seriously with the rules and regulations and conduct of the park.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I understand; but the statement was made during the winter or the fall that the director of parks, and I believe former Representative Kent, contemplated making quite a donation to the Government of land that has some of the big trees upon it.

Mr. GOOD. That was in the Sequoia National Park.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That was the land for additional parks or for new parks.

Mr. GOOD. This is what Mr. Mather says about that:

In the Sequoia National Park we secured the finest stand of timber, known as the Giant Forest. Congress gave us \$50,000 toward the purchase of the Giant Forest, and the National Geographic Society gave us an additional sum for that purpose. In that way we secured the largest and finest trees in the park, but there are some few stands in there now, right in the heart of the park, on which we are getting options. We hope that we will be able to obtain private donations, or we may come to Congress with requests to exchange public lands of equal value for lands within the national park. I think that if we can get this worked out we can get the private titles extinguished without making it too much of a burden on the Treasury, and, perhaps, there will be none at all.

The director goes on to state that he is at work trying to secure donations from individuals of certain tracts of land. Only recently he advised me that he secured an option of 40 acres of big trees in one of the forests—I have forgotten which one—and then went to a large manufacturer, who took up the option and holds the land and is ready to give it to the park. It is land within the park—the park entirely surrounds it—and I think the director is doing a very splendid work in trying to get these private holdings within the boundaries of the park all conveyed to the Government of the United States without the Government having to purchase them. In the same way he is adding to the attractiveness of the parks.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I quite agree with the gentleman. I think Mr. Mather is a great asset to the Government.

Mr. GOOD. I think so myself.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Really a wonderful man.

The Clerk read as follows:

Glacier National Park, Mont.: For administration, protection, maintenance, and improvement, including necessary repairs to the roads from Glacier Park Station through the Blackfeet Indian Reservation to various points in the boundary line of the Glacier National Park and to the international boundary, including not exceeding \$1,000 for the maintenance, repair, and operation of one motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicle and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work, \$95,000.

Mr. HARRELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word to get some information. I notice that the appropriation made for the Glacier National Park in 1916 was \$75,000; in 1920, \$85,000; and in 1921, \$95,000, it being an increase of \$20,000 over that of 1916 and \$10,000 over that of last year. I would like to have some information why it is necessary to have these increases.

Mr. GOOD. The regular appropriation for the current year was \$85,000, with a deficiency of \$62,000 and a further deficiency of \$19,849. The deficiencies had to do largely with the protection of the forests from fire. The amount of the estimate was \$293,000. We carry in the bill \$95,000, which is \$10,000 more than last year. The gentleman complains because it is more than last year, but I want to remind him that in 1917 the appropriation was \$110,000; the appropriation for 1918

was \$115,000. The States have been increasing and improving the highways to the national parks, and the director desired very much to improve the highways in the park. However, the director, after going over this matter very carefully, I think, became convinced that at this time, because of the very high price demanded for materials for road building and for labor, the Government was getting only about 40 cents on the dollar for the money expended; at least that is the judgment of the committee. What the committee has done is to cut these items down to a maintenance item pure and simple. The gentleman may say that it is \$10,000 more than last year. The testimony is that the increase in the wages and materials is practically 20 per cent more than last year, and with the present appropriation it is doubted if we will get as much in the way of maintenance as we had with an appropriation of \$85,000.

Mr. HARRELD. I notice that the appropriation for parks in 1916 was \$242,000 for these same 17 parks, and that this year it amounts to \$904,000, approximately. Will there ever be a time when these parks will be revenue producers rather than an expense?

Mr. GOOD. Out of the appropriation of this year of \$900,000 the director estimates the total increase will amount to \$300,000. That is a growth of about \$185,000 for the last fiscal year. I submit to the gentleman that shows a very healthy growth. The people are beginning to appreciate the national parks, and they will appreciate them more and more just as we are able, as I hope in the near future we will be able, to do something more for the national parks than we have this year. By improving our national parks we will keep many American tourists at home. If any complaint can be made, I think it would be because the committee cut this appropriation as much as it did. It cut it with one end in view, and that was to not appropriate money at a time when we were getting only about 40 cents on the dollar for the amount appropriated, but to postpone the opening up of roads and trails until a more normal condition exists with regard to costs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. HARRELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRELD. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be misunderstood in asking these questions. No one is more in favor of increasing appropriations for parks than I am, but I think at the present time these things ought to be limited to actual necessities. I am asking these questions for information; I am not opposing national parks, because in a few minutes I am going to ask that I be given additional appropriations for a park. I do not want to be considered inconsistent. I have every confidence in the Appropriations Committee. I know how well it has served in holding down expenses of government during these times, when economy should be the watchword. I have not a word of criticism, but I felt that the record of this House should show more fully the necessity for the various increases made in this bill over those of last year. I have heard the explanation of the chairman. It is satisfactory.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD] suggested that possibly there ought to be a considerable increase in the receipts for the use of parks, and some people might think that the gentleman from Oklahoma believes that parks should be self-supporting, although I am quite sure that that is not his policy.

Mr. HARRELD. No.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. East Potomac Park, in the city of Washington, brings in no revenue to the Government. Rock Creek Park, in the city of Washington, brings in no revenue to the Government. In my city the expenses of the parks amount to a good many times the total appropriations in this bill for the maintenance of the national parks, but those parks produce no revenue at all. Yet they much more than pay for the expense of their maintenance. If there is any one thing that is of value to people who work it is to have some recreation parks. Parks are maintained not so much for those who can afford to pay for their use as they are for those who can not afford to pay high expenses in order to make use of them. I am in favor of parks and in favor of the use of parks. I believe that every citizen who goes into a beautiful park and enjoys a rest and recreation amid the beauties of the park makes himself or herself a better citizen of the country. There is nothing, in my judgment, of more value than good parks, both local and national. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to assess and collect from physicians who desire to prescribe the hot waters from the Hot Springs Reservation reasonable charges for the exercise of such

privilege, including fees for examination and registration; and he is also authorized to assess and collect from bath attendants and masseurs operating in all bathhouses receiving hot water from the reservation reasonable charges for the exercise of such privileges. The moneys received from the exercise of this authority shall be used in the protection and improvement of the said reservation.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. The language of this paragraph seems to be rather broad. It gives the Secretary of the Interior authority to assess and collect from physicians who desire to prescribe the hot water from the Hot Springs Reservation reasonable charges, and so forth, for the exercise of such privilege. Suppose a physician in the city of Washington had a patient for whom he desires to prescribe that he shall go to Hot Springs and take the water, how is the Secretary of the Interior going to levy a license fee on that physician?

Mr. GOOD. I think he can do that.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I would like to know how.

Mr. GOOD. The director says he can do it. They require now of every physician before he is authorized to prescribe treatment that he have a license to give a prescription. It is all on a Government reservation, and the Government has the right to regulate practices on its own reservation.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Yes; practices on the reservation, probably true; but it is not confined to that. A physician in Washington can be controlled by the Secretary of the Interior in writing a prescription. It is not confined to physicians at the Hot Springs.

Mr. GOOD. It is the only place where it will have any application.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Of course, I think it is the only place where it will be practicable to apply it, but I have no confidence whatever in some Secretary of the Interior—not the present one, in whom I have all confidence—endeavoring to determine what shall be done about the use of water at the Hot Springs and what shall be done elsewhere.

Mr. GOOD. It is purely a matter of administration.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Well, I do not see upon what theory, by the way, physicians at Hot Springs are to be assessed if they want to prescribe the water there.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Yes; certainly.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Suppose a physician in the city of Washington should prescribe a patient should go to the Glacier Mountain Park, for instance, and ride horseback, he may be charged a license under the same theory?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Certainly; on the same theory, he could be.

Mr. GOOD. This is only intended to apply and will only apply to the physicians who are practicing there and persons who go there for treatment. These waters are not sent out, as I understand it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Oh, but people are sent there.

Mr. GOOD. They are sent there, and when they get there they go to the physician who knows about the medicinal quality of the water of the various springs. Now, an examination is made of the person and then the physician gives him a prescription as to the waters they should use and how they shall be used. Mr. Mather, who appeared before the committee in behalf of the item, feels this is necessary. I know very little about the practice—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It would mean additional fees for going to Hot Springs, because that is what it amounts to, of course.

Mr. GOOD. No; they say not. The director says it is absolutely in the interest of the protection to the man who goes to the Hot Springs, and the doctors have no objection whatever to paying this fee.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Perhaps the doctors there would prefer to pay the fee to keep some other doctor from giving a prescription?

Mr. GOOD. No; it keeps out the quacks.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do not see how this keeps out the quacks. What Secretary of the Interior is going to determine whether a physician can prescribe these waters—

Mr. GOOD. Of course he does not allow everyone to prescribe the waters—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. He is trying now, so far as that goes.

Mr. GOOD. Yes. This merely extends that authority.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. This is for the purpose not only of doing that, but to make charges against the physicians and make charges against the masseurs and make charges against everybody who goes down there to do any work.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman submit to an interruption?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. WINGO. I have not studied the technical language here, but I do understand the law requires the physicians to stand



an examination; in other words, must be registered. This is for the purpose of protecting the patients who go there from being victims of quack physicians, and they are guarded very closely, and they bar and strike from the rolls physicians who are not reputable and not attending properly to their patients. As I recall, when people go there they can only take particular waters under the advice of a physician. It is not safe to take some of them except on advice of a physician. And now the charge assessed against the registration of these bathhouse attendants is to protect the patients against improper attention in these bathhouses. I do not think the intention is to undertake to provide revenue out of it, but solely for the purpose of paying the expenses of registration and of protecting patients who go there. It is considered to be for the benefit of the patients, and it is not to exclude anybody who has knowledge or is qualified to prescribe the waters. Now, I have not examined the language, as I have said—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Probably the gentleman from Arkansas knows in reference to this, but it seems to me as if it would be nonsense. However, I withdraw the point of order. If the people of Arkansas want it, why, of course—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws the point of order.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, just to make one statement. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that the Representative from that district does not happen to be on the floor just at this particular moment. I am very familiar with the situation at the Hot Springs and know a great many people there, and the impression I have gotten is that at the present time these springs are being taken care of and being run better than they have ever been before to protect the people who go there for their health from all parts of the earth. The present superintendent of the springs is admitted by all reputable physicians to be trying to protect the people who go there in every way, and whenever he finds a doctor who he thinks is not a reputable physician, who is not acting properly, then he looks after him and gets after him and has him brought up, and frequently doctors have come to Washington to appeal to the Secretary of the Interior, and I have not heard any complaint of this arrangement except from those who claim they have been charged with being incompetent; but the general impression that I get from people there is that the present management is better than ever before and that the people who visit that place are better protected.

They can go to the office of the superintendent on the avenue there, and they can get a list of registered physicians, and they can go to any physician on that list and rest assured that he is a reputable man and will not make improper charges or neglect them, but will see that they get the treatment necessary. The object at the springs now is to try to protect the people who go there.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mount Rainier National Park, Wash.: For administration, protection, maintenance, and improvement, including not exceeding \$800 for the maintenance, operation, and repair of a motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicle for use of the superintendent and park employees in connection with general park work, \$40,000.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the National Park Service.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the National Park Service. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Platt National Park, Okla.: For administration, protection, maintenance, and improvement, \$6,000.

Mr. HARRELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. HARRELD: Strike out lines 9 and 10, page 112, and substitute therefor the words "Platt National Park, Okla.: For administration, protection, maintenance, improvement, and extension of sewer system, including the purchase of a wagon and team of mules for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with the national-park work and the purchase of provender therefor, \$9,000."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. HARRELD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am actuated in asking for this increased appropriation for this little park because it happens to be in my district, and because of the necessity of the situation. I was in this park some five months ago, and it is deplorable to see the condition which exists there. It is a nice park, something on the order of Rock Creek Park in

Washington. If the same amount of money was spent on that park that is expended in Rock Creek Park it would be a much more beautiful one; and it has this in addition to recommend it, that it is a health resort. There are to be found there some of the finest sulphur springs in the United States, and perhaps the finest bromide water in the United States. This bromide water was so valued by Uncle Sam that a few years ago he kept a guard over the spring and would not allow anyone to carry water away, because it was so valuable in the treatment of nervous diseases. Nobody could take it away, but could go there and drink it by the cup. Of course, lately that has not been kept up. This park was formerly known as Sulphur Springs National Park, and was established way back yonder when that country belonged to the Indians, for the benefit of the Indians, and since the whites have settled up that country they, too, have been coming in their wagons and their cars to drink of that water and recover their health. So it has that advantage over these other parks about which we are talking. It is not only a pleasure park but a health resort, 1 of 2 of the 17 parks included in this bill which in addition to being pleasure parks are also health resorts.

Right here I want to say that I am not opposed to beautifying and improving our parks. The questions I asked were simply meant to bring out the importance of these appropriations, and I will go my friend from Illinois [Mr. MANN] one better, and say that I hope the time will come when we will not only be able to do the right thing with these parks in the way of improving and beautifying them, but we shall appropriate money to build roads and connect them up with highways that will make them more accessible to the poor of this country who need these parks, as my friend from Illinois said.

As I said, I visited this park in November and I was struck with the deplorable conditions there. The pavilions over these springs—and there are several of them that the Government built at great expense—are absolutely rotting down. The 5 miles of hard-surface road that the Government built in the park is going to wreck because they have not a team of mules with which to improve it.

Formerly the Government appropriated \$17,500 for this park, and then it dropped to \$10,000, and then to \$8,000. In 1916 and 1917 the appropriation was \$8,000, and during the war it was dropped to \$6,000, and for the last two years there had been appropriated \$6,000. It is the only park in the list for which the appropriation has gradually decreased. The others have all increased until, as against \$242,000 in 1916, there is this year being appropriated \$904,000. But this is the only park in the list where there has been a decrease.

I found the conditions there deplorable in this, that there is only one available camp ground that can be used by these people who come there in their wagons and cars. It belongs to the city of Sulphur, which lies alongside of this park, and I found when I was there last fall that this camp ground had been closed to the public because of insanitary conditions; and hundreds of people coming to that park were obliged to turn around and go back home because they could not find a place on which to camp. So I ask you to give an appropriation of \$2,000, which is necessary to connect up the sewerage, which is already in this park, with this camp ground, so that the people who come there this summer may be able to use that camp ground in enjoying the privileges of that park for the benefit of their health.

Now, when I got here last fall I found that the superintendent had already made his recommendation of \$6,000 again for this year. You will understand I did not get here until the 1st of December, after a special election. I went to work immediately and tried to get the superintendent to increase his recommendation for this appropriation. In that case I asked for \$5,000 more. He would not agree to increase the recommendation, because he had already made it, but he did write a letter to the Committee on Appropriations, in which he said that \$5,200 could be spent to very fine advantage on this park. I have a copy of that letter. I do not know whether that constitutes a recommendation or not; but, anyway, the committee did not see fit to follow it, and I presume they had reasons for it. I am not impugning its motives. The fact is that both the committee and its chairman are entitled to much credit for the efforts they have put forward in the interest of economy—I have done my best to assist them in their plan of economy—but it is not economy to fail to keep up improvements that have already been made, or to refuse appropriations that are actually necessary, as in this case.

I want to say here now that I want to pay a compliment to Mr. Mather. I think that he is the man of all men that we should have as superintendent of these great parks of ours. The only trouble is that he does not know anything of the conditions in this particular park, and therefore recommends a

smaller appropriation than is really necessary. We need a larger appropriation to keep up the park and its four or five pavilions and its 4 or 5 miles of road, with this creek that needs to be kept clear of debris, and the approaches to the bridges are washed out and should be repaired. And all of this is impossible to do unless this commission is given a team of mules. They are so poor that they have not got even a team of mules to haul off the brush and to cut the weeds and repair the 5 or 6 miles of road. The superintendent, who is a brother of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS], told me that he took his own team of mules and worked in that park to cut down the weeds and to make repairs for three months last year without cost to the Government, but that he could not do it again this year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma have five minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I am very much interested in the statement of the gentleman. This park is a matter of old controversy in this House. For a number of years this House has tried to give this park away, but nobody would take it. Now, I presume we are going to keep it.

Mr. HARRELD. I would like to ask the gentleman a question right there. Does he not think that if we are going to keep it we ought to do something for it?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That was what I was going to get at. If we are going to keep it, I think we ought to do something with it. I did not catch the full import of the gentleman's amendment, but, as I understand, all he has asked for is a team of mules.

Mr. HARRELD. No. I was asking for an increase of \$3,000 only; \$1,000 of which is to be used in the purchase of the team of mules to do this work and for the purchase of provender and \$2,000 for the extension of the sewer system.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. A team of mules for operation would involve a good deal of expense. They need material and labor. They have not got their material and labor. So far as I know the appropriation of \$6,000 is nearly all used for salaries.

Mr. HARRELD. It provides for three laborers, but they have got nothing to work with.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. They would not have much more to work with if all they had additional was the team of mules.

Mr. MacGREGOR. They are to be intelligent mules. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARRELD. They would have \$1,140 out of the original appropriation of \$6,000, and the \$2,000 for sewer extension, which I am asking for in this amendment.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do not know whether we ought to keep the park or not, but I guess we will have to, because no one else will take it. It is valuable for its waters. There is no park there except the waters. That is all there is to it. They have valuable medicinal waters there. I think that is admitted. Let the gentleman tell us more about it.

Mr. HARRELD. I will tell you more about it. The gentleman does not know anything about it if he thinks it is valuable for its waters only. [Laughter.] This park, as I said a while ago, when the lands of the Indian Territory were allotted among the Indians in severalty, was left there for the benefit of the Indian tribes. At that time it was not contemplated that the whites would ever settle that country. It is a beautiful little park, about 4 miles by 6 in dimensions, if I understand it aright; and I want to say right now that it rivals Rock Creek Park, right close to this city. It is in the Arbuckle Mountains, right in the middle of the mountains, and there is an ever-flowing stream through the center of it. They have two bridges over it which the Government has built. It is more heavily timbered and the valley is wider than that of Rock Creek Park out here on the outskirts of Washington. It is a park that the people get a great deal of benefit from. As I said before, it is one of the two parks that is a pleasure park and noted for its medicinal waters at the same time. Now, why should a park that is both a pleasure park and a health resort be abandoned absolutely in favor of a park which is only for pleasure?

There is another thing to be said about it: I had a talk with Mr. Mather, and he told me that his plan contemplated some day having a highway system connecting all these parks. If that plan is carried out this park will be found to be on the direct line of that highway system between the other great parks and Hot Springs, Ark.—and it is only one day's travel from Hot Springs, Ark., to this park—and in the natural course that that highway would have to take when it is built, going from Hot Springs National Park to the other parks of the Rocky

Mountains, this Platt National Park would be a good link in the chain, and I believe it ought to be preserved for that purpose if for no other.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, what sort of ills are these waters supposed to cure?

Mr. HARRELD. The sulphur water is good for stomach troubles. The bromide water is practically all the water that there is of that kind in this country; it is good for nervous diseases and is demonstrated to be very efficient in such cases.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. HARRELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRELD. This is what I want to say, gentlemen: The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] said that Congress has been trying to get rid of this park for a long time. That is no reason why you should let it go to rack. If you want to get rid of this park, keep it up in shape until you can get rid of it. As long as the Government owns that park it ought not to absolutely ignore it. I am not asking for a great big appropriation to beautify it and make it a great pleasure resort. I am only asking for what is absolutely necessary to keep that park in shape and preserve the improvements we already have made there, and I am limiting it to only \$3,000 increase. Now, whether or not you want to preserve that park, whether or not you want to carry out the plan of finally getting rid of that park, so long as we have got it I believe it is our duty to preserve it and protect it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has again expired.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. McKEOWN. I do not understand that this amendment would be subject to a point of order, although the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goon] has reserved a point of order against it.

Mr. GOOD. The entire item is subject to a point of order.

Mr. McKEOWN. The entire item is?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. Then are not all the items for all these parks subject to a point of order?

I want to say to the gentleman in reference to this park, after what my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD] has already said, that this is one of the beauty spots of the Southwest. It is one of the places that the Indian tribes of Oklahoma have where they go and camp and get the benefits of the medicinal waters in that park. I want to say to you that if people who have never enjoyed the benefits of this bromide water—and there are thousands of them in the United States—could only get the benefits of that water, there would be less nervous disease and nervous trouble in the country. That bromide water is a water which, when drunk and bathed in, will enable nervous people who are troubled with insomnia and can not sleep to so improve that in three or four days they can sleep with the peaceful slumber of a baby. It settles and quiets their nerves, and the water is in such great demand that the United States Government permits the allowance of only half a gallon to each applicant each day. The water is limited in quantity. It is said by those who have examined it to be better than the waters of Carlsbad, and yet, because it is away out in Oklahoma, away in the Southwest, where no money has been expended to advertise it and where the superintendents of parks have not visited it, and because it has not attracted the wealthy people of the country to go there, there is this talk about small appropriations and this talk about abandoning this park. Why, gentlemen, let me say to you that this park, while it is small and situated in a new State, can yet be enjoyed by any American citizen and can be made more enjoyable than some of these parks upon which you spend thousands of dollars, because there are no large concessions to hotel people and transportation people which require high charges, such as obtain in those better-known national parks which are visited only by the wealthy, who for temporary purposes are confining their migratory activities to the scenery afforded in the United States instead of going abroad.

This park is a place where the American Indian in his native country can go and camp in his tent and enjoy the water that nature has provided for him. These children of the forests and plains can not go there now, because there is not sufficient money to provide sanitary conditions for them to camp in this park. And, gentlemen, this appropriation ought not to be merely for \$3,000 additional. It ought to be for \$5,000 addi-



tional, because I agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that you will not be able to do much with a team of mules on the \$3,000 that is provided here.

Sometimes here in this House I have heard some Members who are not familiar with the great West suggest that the United States Government ought to just give the West its public lands, and all these things, in order to get rid of them; that they are so much of a burden. Let me remind some of these gentlemen that the State of Oklahoma in 1917 was second in the American Union in the payment of excess-profits taxes into the Treasury of the United States. I want to say that in justice to my State. Gentlemen, I hope you will give this matter your careful consideration, and that you will give this little allowance that they have asked down there, that will do so much benefit and so much good to the people of that section of the country.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation and offer the following amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute offered by Mr. Good for the amendment offered by Mr. HARRELD:

"Platt National Park, Okla.: Pursuant to the authority conveyed in section 64 of the act approved July 1, 1902 (Stats. L., vol. 32, p. 656), all of the land comprising the Platt National Park in the State of Oklahoma is transferred and title thereto vested in the State of Oklahoma.

"If the State of Oklahoma shall fail or refuse to accept the Platt National Park as herein authorized to be conveyed to it from the United States, the same shall be appraised and sold either by sealed proposals for the purchase of the same or by public auction after advertisement of the sale for such time as in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior the public interest may require, the proceeds of such sale, after payment therefrom of the expenses of making the same, to be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. GOOD. I do not think it is subject to the point of order.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Oh, well, then I will make the point of order. It is clearly legislation, and subject to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GOOD. I should like to ask the gentleman from Illinois just what part of the amendment his point of order is directed against?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Against all of it. The whole amendment is legislation and nothing else. Whether the original item in the bill is subject to a point of order or not, I do not undertake to say. I do not know. I do not recall. But that is only for administration of the park. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD] was only in reference to the administration of the park. That is an appropriation, not legislation. It may be an appropriation not authorized by law. That has nothing to do with the question; but this amendment proposed by the gentleman from Iowa is legislation and nothing but legislation.

Mr. GOOD. I think there is no question but what it is legislation. It is legislation under the Holman rule.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Oh, no.

Mr. GOOD. It is legislation to carry out the legislation that created the national parks. The section of the statute referred to in the amendment, the statute creating this park approved July 1, 1902, carries the following provision:

*Provided, however,* That nothing contained in this section shall be construed or held to commit the Government of the United States to any expenditure of money upon said land or the improvement thereof except as provided for herein, it being the intention of this provision that in the future the lands and improvements therein mentioned shall be conveyed by the United States to such territorial or State organization as may exist at the time when the conveyance is made.

Keeping that matter in mind, keeping in mind the statement of Mr. Mather that this was a park visited in the main by the people of Sulphur, that it was a local park, and when it was ceded to the National Government by the two tribes of Indians who owned the land—not a strip of land 4 miles by 6, as the gentleman from Oklahoma states, but a little over one section of land—it carried the express provision that the Government only took title to it until such time as the State of Oklahoma should take it back. The amendment which I have offered is in line with the provisions carried in that provision of law. The committee were perfectly willing to let the matter rest where it was and to give for this park every penny that the director had asked for simply as a maintenance proposition while the Government was holding title to the park for the town of Sulphur. But now when it comes to improving this

park and putting on other additional improvements to land that we simply hold in trust, to a park that is not national in any sense of the word and can not be made national, it seems to me stretching the authority a good deal to ask us to appropriate money for permanent improvements for that kind of a tract of land.

Mr. HARRELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. HARRELD. I will ask the gentleman if he did not get a letter from Mr. Mather, the park commissioner, asking that \$5,200 should be appropriated for this purpose?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; and Mr. Mather said before the committee that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD] had been to see him and wanted him to make another estimate, and he said if it was the desire of the committee to have him increase his estimate he would increase it; but the Committee on Appropriations were not asking anyone to increase his estimate. Here is a letter, and I want the Members to hear the reading of it and see if there is a Member here who would act favorably to increase this appropriation over the amount estimated on this kind of a statement.

This is the letter:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,  
Washington, April 9, 1920.

Hon. JAMES W. GOOD,  
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,  
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. GOOD: I have just received a letter from Hon. J. W. HARRELD, of Oklahoma, in which he refers to a recent hearing which the Committee on Appropriations accorded him on the question of an appropriation for Platt National Park additional to the estimate of \$6,000 submitted by the Interior Department. Mr. HARRELD feels that as a result of his presentation the committee is interested.

Of course, in view of my conversation with you several weeks ago, I do not see how I could consistently ask the Secretary to submit a formal supplemental estimate at this time, but I would add that if the committee feels disposed to act favorably on the additional sum of \$5,200 proposed by Mr. HARRELD, the National Park Service will be able to use it to very good advantage in the betterment of the park in the following manner:

Purchase of mules, feeds, etc.....	\$1,500
Purchase of garden and other small tools.....	605
Installing toilets and connecting with sewer in auto camp grounds.....	2,000
Repairing existing buildings in park.....	1,095
	5,200

Very truly, yours,

STEPHEN T. MATHER, Director.

Anyone who knows Mr. Mather knows that he was not asking for any more than \$6,000, which the committee granted him. Anyone that knows him and knows the wonderful service he has given to the Government in building up the national-park system, knows that Mr. Mather's heart was not in any proposal that would take out of the Treasury of the United States \$5,200 for this purpose. It seems to me the amendment I have offered is within the Holman rule. It is to carry out a certain proposal when the park was taken over, and that is to reconvey it to the State.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. Has the President or the Secretary of the Interior recommended anything like the proposal in the substitute offered by the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. GOOD. I think not.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman from Iowa has never visited this park?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, no; I never knew that the park existed until recently. I do remember some discussion on the floor of the House, but I do not think many Members in the Chamber know anything about the park. It is a State park. In my town we have a much larger park called Beaver Park, but I do not suppose that gentlemen have heard of it. We spend four or five times as much as the Government spends on this park.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman's substitute is something that he offers of his own motion, without the recommendation from any official of the Government?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; the same as the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma. Only my amendment is made in conformity with the statute that made provision for the taking of this park from these two tribes of Indians, or took the title to it, and which provided that nothing in the act should bind the Government to pay out any money for improvements. By this amendment I eliminate the \$6,000. The State ought to have the park if it is such a beautiful park and so great an attraction. The State ought to take some pride in it and ought to be willing to take the park back and make it a great State park.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The amendment of the gentleman from Iowa admittedly contains provisions of legislation. The gentleman from Iowa says, first, that

it is in order because the legislative provision is in accordance with the proviso in the act creating the national park, which provided—

That nothing in this act shall be construed or held to commit the Government of the United States to any expenditure of money on said plans of improvement therefor, except as provided herein, it being the intention of this provision that in the future the land and improvements herein mentioned shall be conveyed by the United States to such Territory, State, or organization as may exist at the time said conveyance is made.

That provision seems to the Chair to contemplate that legislation will at some time be had in accordance with this policy. But the mere fact that it contemplates legislation does not remove or change the character of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa as legislation, but confirms the Chair's opinion that the amendment is legislation.

The gentleman from Iowa also contends that the provision is in order under the Holman rule. If the first portion of the amendment were in order under the Holman rule the second portion is clearly not in order under the Holman rule, and under the rule which is to the effect that if any portion of an amendment is subject to a point of order the whole amendment is subject to a point of order, the Chair sustains the point of order.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Good) there were 37 ayes and 14 noes.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Rocky Mountain National Park, Colo.: For administration, protection, maintenance, and improvement, \$20,000.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 112, line 12, strike out the figures "\$20,000" and insert "\$40,000."

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it is with a good deal of reluctance that I present for your consideration this amendment to this appropriation bill. I sympathize deeply with the policy of the committee in its attitude in reducing appropriations for public expenditure in this bill. I think though, that this can be carried sometimes to a point where great injustice will be done. I believe that this is specially true with reference to the appropriation for the Rocky Mountain National Park carried in this bill and which the amendment I offer seeks to remedy.

Those of you who have read the hearings and know the appropriations that have been made for the several parks will recognize that the appropriation for this park is double the amount of the previous appropriations made for this park for the past five years, and they may infer that that is generous treatment by the committee in the consideration of this park.

I feel that it is necessary to say that that is not the fact, and state some of the ancient history in regard to this park. This Rocky Mountain National Park has an area of 254,000 acres in the central part of the United States, as I will show from a very poor map which I have here which I ask Members to look at. It is given this year \$20,000 in order that the park service may make the park one of the most beautiful in the country, one which has been visited by more people than any other national park belonging to the Government. Last year there were in attendance on this park 169,402 people. That number registered in the park. The Mount Rainier National Park is given an appropriation of \$40,000. I do not think that is asking too much or that they receive too much, and yet in view of the fact that their area is only about 200,000 acres and our park far exceeds that amount and the number of people visiting the Rocky Mountain National Park so largely exceeding the number visiting Mount Rainier National Park, we do not think it is too much to ask that we have \$40,000 for this park.

This park was created in 1915, and under the provisions of the act it was provided that no appropriation in excess of \$10,000 should be made for its maintenance without special authorization of Congress. We of the West have to thank very largely for his aid in helping get this bill enacted into law the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] who has in a very forceful way this morning set forth the appreciation he has for national parks as national assets. He believes in their improvement. If this park is to be accessible to the people, and if the people are to receive benefits from it, it is necessary that it be developed in the way of trails and roads. With the \$10,000 limitation it is impossible to very much more than pay the expense of the supervisor and the various rangers. Very little is left with which to make improvements in the park.

After coming here and recognizing this condition, I sought for three terms to get this inhibition removed. I succeeded only last year in having this removed, so that for five years we have had an appropriation of only \$10,000. In view of that I felt completely justified, in view of the estimates presented by the Director of the Forest Service for an appropriation of \$150,000 which he deemed necessary to make this accessible to the people, to come before you at this time and ask for a small increase of \$20,000, or a total appropriation of \$40,000.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MADDEN). The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. What has been appropriated for this park heretofore?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Ten thousand dollars a year.

Mr. CANNON. Nothing over that?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Nothing over that.

Mr. CANNON. And the bill carries \$20,000.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. And the gentleman seeks to make that \$40,000?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. And we are all for a reduction of expenditures in appropriations.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I have been trying to explain that to the gentleman. I sympathize, as he does, with the efforts of the committee to reduce appropriations, but I sometimes think, and in this case I think, it is false economy for the Government to fail to make this park accessible to the people who desire to visit it. As I stated, more people visited this park last year than visited any other park which we have, and yet there are no roads there. We get no income from it. Under the provisions of the bill creating this park, it was the first park that was discriminated against in that respect. It was stated in the bill that no receipts from the park should be used in connection with its maintenance, and that the receipts should be covered into the Treasury of the United States. That was the first park that had that provision in respect to it. It is true that since June, 1917, there has been a provision of legislation that makes that apply to all parks, so that the receipts from all of them are now covered into the Treasury of the United States.

There is no automobile charge for entrance into the Rocky Mountain National Park, as is the case with Mount Rainier. The receipts from Mount Rainier last year were something like \$20,000, while the receipts from the Rocky Mountain National Park were only \$300. The park service can not consistently charge an entrance fee from automobiles where the Government has failed to build any roads that are fit to be used by them. For that reason there have been no receipts, or appreciably none, that are covered into the Treasury of the United States. I do not desire to delay the passage of this bill, and I appeal to you in the interest of what I think is good economy, that the park service be given an opportunity to expend at least this much during the present year in making this park accessible to all of the people.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Yes.

Mr. VAILE. Will not the gentleman call attention to the fact that this park by its geographical location is far more accessible to the rest of the country, and especially to the Middle West and the Southwest, than a park located on the Pacific coast—at the same time not wishing to indicate that those parks should not have the appropriations that are made for them?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. That is true. It is almost in the center, geographically, of the whole country. I have heard it said that this is a Denver park. I want to disabuse anyone of that idea. This map shows the Rocky Mountain National Park, and it will be seen that Denver is 65 or 70 miles distant from it. Colorado is interested in the development of the park and is aiding to make this park accessible. This year the legislature of that State appropriated \$60,000 for the completion of the Fall River Road, which is a highway running clear through to the west line of the park, and previously had spent much more, and the counties of Boulder and Larimer have, at great expense, built splendid roads leading into the park.



The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has again expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, my colleague [Mr. TIMBERLAKE] has presented the need of this additional appropriation so thoroughly that it leaves very little to say. I think the House ought to bear in mind the point he makes as to the accessibility of this park. The Government gets or could get a large amount of fees from the automobile licenses that enter this park. This is the first park in the United States that is encountered when people go west. It is so easily accessible to everyone that nearly everyone goes there. The counties and the State have built fine roads to the park, and consequently many thousands of automobiles do go there and many thousands more would go there and go through the park and over to Grand Lake and other wonderful scenery on the opposite side of the main range of the Rocky Mountains if the Government would aid some in building additional and better roads and trails and more accommodations. Additional money is needed also to protect the park, to guard the scenery, to regulate traffic, and take care of the people who go there, to build more garages to care for the traveling public. It is purely along the public-health and public-spirited line the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has so eloquently expressed that we ought to encourage the outdoor recreation of the American people. The American people ought to see and become acquainted with the marvelous scenery of our own country.

It would make them more contented and better citizens, and as this is one of the very best and grandest, as well as the most accessible, park there is in the United States, Congress ought to spend whatever sum is necessary to make it as nearly as possible accessible to all the traveling public, with suitable care and accommodations for them.

Mr. LAYTON. What about the people who do not travel?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Of course, there are unfortunately many thousands of people who can not visit this or any of the other national parks of the West. I wish everybody in the United States could see those parks. But if they are made as accessible as possible, that will encourage people to go there, and everyone who goes west can and should visit this park.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. VAILE. If I may suggest to the gentleman, in one day's trip he will see cars—small cars, inexpensive cars, flivvers—from Oklahoma, Nebraska, Iowa, and even from the gentleman's own State, if he goes out there—

Mr. LAYTON. Oh, it would not make any difference if every automobile registered in the State of Delaware were to go to that national park. Under the present circumstances of the Treasury of the United States I do not believe in undertaking increased expenditures where they can be put off for a time. I do not wish to be placed in the category of those who do not appreciate the splendid heritage the country possesses in the national parks, comprising natural scenery unsurpassed anywhere in the world, but at this time I desire to go on record as opposing for the present any appropriation which is not absolutely necessary for the public welfare. When the national finances are stabilized and taxation reduced, when our income exceeds our expenditures, no one will vote more heartily or with greater appreciation for such matters as are now before us than I, but at this hour economy is an imperative necessity, or the consequences will be disastrous to the whole country.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I am as much in favor of economy as anyone and I always vote that way. There is a large volume of talk about economy in this House and very little practicing of it. But this appropriation is a matter of business economy. If the park was properly improved, there would be thousands more automobiles going there every year, and the Government might charge a small entrance fee and get all this money back, and I hope this amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. LAYTON. Will this increase in the expenditures increase the revenues?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes. Because it will properly take care of the people and encourage many more of them to go there. The park accommodation is in a very congested condition now. There are thousands and tens of thousands of cars going into that park every year. I do not know what the revenues are, but they could be made very large.

Mr. LAYTON. What are the receipts?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. My colleague [Mr. TIMBERLAKE] can tell that.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. What is the question?

Mr. LAYTON. What are the latest receipts from this park?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Why, they are only nominal now, only amounting to \$307, because they did not charge for automobile licenses because—

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. But when they can build proper trails and roads and other developments they can charge a reasonable fee and derive a large revenue from it if that policy is deemed advisable.

Mr. LAYTON. They are going to spend \$40,000 to get \$300? Mr. VAILE. They are going to spend this money to give health to the American people, the same way as in the gentleman's own State, not to get \$300.

Mr. HARDY of Colorado. Let me say a word about the receipt business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARDY of Colorado. I move to strike out a few words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can not do that.

Mr. GOOD. I will yield the gentleman a couple of minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. There are five minutes additional remaining.

Mr. GOOD. I am asking for recognition, and I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARDY of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, the Rocky Mountain National Park, to begin with, is a different kind of park from that we have been talking about in Oklahoma. This park is five times as big as the District of Columbia. It contains 358 square miles. It was taken over by the National Government about four or five years ago. The park has never had more than \$10,000 a year, not enough money to develop it. You can not charge automobile fees or automobile licenses unless you have roads for them to go over. The Mount Rainier National Park in two years cost the United States Government \$57,100 and took in in automobile fees and other receipts \$39,475. The Mount Rainier National Park only had last year 55,232 people visit it, and the Rocky Mountain National Park had 169,492 people to visit it. I think as a permanent policy we ought not to try to make our park self-sustaining. But during the period of development we are entitled to charge something to the people who come in cars in order that the national parks may be developed more rapidly. The Rocky Mountain National Park is so close to the center of the country that we have thousands of cars from Texas, Oklahoma, Iowa, Kansas, and near-by States. If you gentlemen from Texas and Oklahoma would campaign in it, you would find many of your voters there and the climate much more comfortable than in your own States. We need this money, and in a few years this Government will get the money back. We had 33,000 automobiles in the Rocky Mountain Park last year. By charging \$2 apiece, which could be done if anything had been done by the United States Government to help develop this park, we would have had \$66,000 from that source, so by spending a little money we might make a revenue producer of that magnificent park. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, this is a great national park, comprising, as the gentleman says, something like 254,000 acres, and a great many people visit the park, and the reason why the park does not have more revenue than \$307 a year is because we have not developed the roads and trails in the park. This appropriation is just twice the appropriation for the current year and it will enable them to start a little on their work. The committee was not unmindful of the fact that in the near future considerable development work will be necessary in this park. We will be compelled to build some roads through this park, which is a wonderful park, but under present conditions the committee felt that it would be compelled to treat this park just as it treated the other national parks and practically confine the work to maintenance, and therefore it has carried in this bill \$20,000, which is just twice the appropriation of former years, and I sincerely hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the yeas seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. TIMBERLAKE) there were—ayes 14, yeas 25.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Yosemite National Park, Calif.: For administration, protection, maintenance, and improvement, including not exceeding \$1,800 for purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of horse-drawn and motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work, \$275,000.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking why the form of all these appropriations is changed this year. Is it on account of some technical ruling?

Mr. GOOD. No; but to make them uniform. Heretofore there has been a difference in the phraseology, and it seemed to the committee that inasmuch as these appropriations are for similar objects, the only difference being expenditures in different parks, that the language carrying the appropriation should be uniform.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Well, I do not think that the law heretofore has carried the words "administration" or "maintenance." It may in some one case—

Mr. GOOD. It has always been provided for and paid out of the appropriation.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I understand that. I am not criticizing the form, but I wondered whether there had been some technical ruling on the subject as to why the committee added those two words.

Mr. GOOD. I had not in mind the two words referred to; but they were not carried in this item, but in the Yellowstone appropriation; for instance, it is carried for administration and maintenance, and the committee felt, inasmuch as—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. They were in one case, I think, maybe one other; but as a rule the language read before "for protection and improvement." Now it reads, "for administration, protection, maintenance, and improvement," and I just ask if this was caused by a ruling with reference to it or a desire to add language to the appropriation bill?

Mr. GOOD. No; the committee is not advised as to any ruling that would interfere because the money was used for administration and maintenance, and inasmuch as it was carried in the same items in this language the committee felt that as it was available for this purpose the language should be uniform.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Zion National Park, Utah: For administration, protection, maintenance, and improvement, \$2,500.

Mr. WELLING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. WELLING: Page 113, line 19, after the words "improvement," strike out "\$2,500" and insert "\$7,300."

Mr. WELLING. Mr. Chairman, the estimates furnished to the committee for the maintenance of this park for the next fiscal year amounted to \$10,000, as follows: Salaries for chief ranger, rangers, clerk, \$5,100; maintenance and repairs, \$2,200; and construction of highways, \$2,700. I believe the chairman of the committee, upon reflection, will feel that since this park has been established the appropriation for it ought to be increased above that which has been allowed in the past as a national monument. This park comprises an area of a little more than 70,000 acres, or about 113 square miles. From an archaeological point of view it is one of the most interesting pieces of public land in America to-day. Along the perpendicular walls of this canyon gorge are the prehistoric dwelling places of the cliff dwellers of America. The scientists of the Smithsonian Institution and of almost every western university go into this region every year for the purpose of excavating in these important prehistoric ruins. Geologically, it is one of the most important scenic wonders of America. No increase has been given to this park over the amount heretofore granted to the national monument, and it seems to me that since it has been established as a national park some additional funds ought to be provided for its proper maintenance. I am not asking a cent, in accord with the views expressed by the distinguished chairman of this committee that the House at this time should not spend additional money on improvements in the national parks, but surely there ought to be given sufficient money for the police protection of the park and for the proper protection of these ancient ruins that have been found there. I sincerely hope the committee will adopt the amendment increasing the amount about \$5,000.

This park is peculiarly a national institution. It does not belong to Salt Lake City, nor is it adjacent, as are many of our parks, to any great city. It lies on the main highway of what will soon be a direct route from the thickly settled area of the intermountain country to the northern rim of the Grand Canyon of the Colorado.

The State of Utah, recognizing the need and value of this great national recreation and educational center, has appropriated more than \$200,000 to build a great highway to the gateway of the park, and the small amount asked for in this appropriation will barely police and care for the property of the Government.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Chairman, as we are just concluding the part of the bill relating to the national parks, it is an oppor-

tune time to call attention to the annual conclave of the Imperial Council of the Shriners, which is to be held in Portland, Oreg., on June 22, 23, and 24 of this year. It is opportune to do this because it is expected that many of the Shriners, in going to the council and returning, will visit our national parks. It is hoped that many of the Shriners will visit the wonderful Crater Lake Park in Oregon.

For several months I have had up the matter with the National Park Service of clearing the roads of snow leading to Crater Lake National Park in my district, so that the Shriners may view this wonderful phenomenon of nature. I have had assurance from Director Mather that the park service will do all in its power to clear the road of snow by the time the Shriners visit Portland, Oreg. I think the park service will be justified in going to every expense to afford the Nobles of this great order a view of this wonderful scene. They will return "boosters" of the National Park Service.

#### CRATER LAKE.

Crater Lake is situated in Klamath County, Oreg., in the southwestern corner of my district. It is a lake, cauldronlike and circular, 7,000 feet high, perched amid the peaks. Perpendicular sides of slaggy lava rise over a thousand feet from waters of indigo blue 6 miles across and 2,000 feet deep.

To the scientist, a mighty volcano collapsed within itself, Mount Mazama, 15,000 feet high, telescoped.

To the poet, "the sea of sapphire," "the sea of silence," "a lake of mystery."

To me, a shell hole of a war of worlds—who knows?

Could the great blind poet have seen this marvel ere his pen had Lucifer and his host of rebel angels—

Hurled headlong flaming from the ethereal sky.  
With hideous ruin and combustion down—

in Miltonic imagery here he'd have found the impact. [Loud applause.]

The Shriners will go to Crater Lake through Medford, in my colleague's [Mr. HAWLEY] district, or through Klamath Falls, in my district.

#### BEND.

After making the pilgrimage to Crater Lake the Shriners should go to Bend, in central Oregon, in my district. From Bend they will see the great amphitheater of hills which rise and radiate from the Columbia to the cardinal points. They will see how hill piles on hill. How the hills rise in the purple haze of twilight like billows suddenly stilled on the crest. They will see the rim of the amphitheater and horizon from central Oregon, pillared with a dozen lofty, eternal snow-capped peaks, once blazing beacons, now only reflecting above the dusk of the valleys from lofty eminences of snow and ice, the soft pink glow of setting sun, as the day drops into the westward waters of the Pacific. [Applause.]

These snow-capped peaks are our reservoirs, eternal, exhaustless in life-giving waters, in energy, and power.

#### COLUMBIA'S GORGE.

After seeing the mountains in their majesty from Bend the pilgrimage should continue to The Dalles through the Deschutes Canyon, so narrow that it might have been cut with a "saber stroke" of Mars. The Dalles, at the end of the old Oregon trail, is my home and birthplace. Here the Shriners will see where the great inland sea, which once covered eastern Oregon, Washington, and parts of Idaho, according to the geologists, broke through the barrier of the Cascades Range in some titanic convulsion of nature.

The Indian legend is that Mount Hood and Mount Adams, once espoused, engaged in a mighty marital combat, whose struggles broke the mountain barrier, and the inland sea disappeared through the gorge of the Columbia.

The Indian's awe even now bears witness to the tribe's tradition. From his canoe, as he glides through the Columbia's gorge, he sees the two mythical mates of a Miocene age, Hood and Adams, now hiding behind the towering hills, ever and anon, through favorable gaps in the gorge, stealing furtive peeps each at the other.

It may be so. Perhaps the Indian, "who sees God in the wind," witnessed some colossal cataclysm of nature. The surroundings bear evidence of the epochal. A broad river suddenly turns on edge at train speed, rushes through a gash in the lava flow. Palisades, a sheer thousand feet, dwarfing the Hudson's, rise from the water's edge. Giant causeways abound, dwarfing Erin's.

These are but few of the marvels of the mountains which we shall show unto the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine. We expect few of the Shriners will ever leave our State. We shall hold them as willing, voluntary captives to the charms of where rolls the Oregon when they view these scenes, when they witness the



billowy wheat fields of eastern Oregon and partake of the delicious Dalles cherry, the luscious Hood River strawberry, and the incomparable Hood River apple.

We know the visiting Nobles will exclaim with the poet, Joaquin Miller, who said the scenes a part of which I have feebly portrayed brought his love of song to the surface:

See once these stately scenes, then roam no more;  
No more remains on earth to cultured eyes;  
The cataract comes down, a broken roar,  
The palisades defy approach, and rise  
Green moss'd and dripping to the clouded skies.  
The canyon thunders with its full of foam,  
And calls loud-mouth'd, and all the land defies;  
The mounts make fellowship and dwell at home  
In snowy brotherhood beneath their purpled dome.

All this, and even more than tongue can tell, awaits the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine on their pilgrimage to the hills of Oregon, "rock ribbed and ancient as the sun." [Loud applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, after the eloquent speech of the gentleman from Oregon on this wonderful park, it seems almost like dropping from the sublime to the ridiculous to commence to speak about Zion National Park, and yet the amendment before the House has to do with that park. Now, Zion National Park was a national monument until an act of Congress approved last November—

Mr. MADDEN. Zion is a little bit higher than the highest snow peak the gentleman was talking about, is it not?

Mr. GOOD. This is another Zion. This is Zion National Park out in Utah that I am discussing. For the current year there was an appropriation of \$10,000 for national monuments. There are 10 of them. But by the act of Congress approved November 29, 1919, Zion was made a national park. Therefore the appropriations for national monuments would not be available longer for this park, and it was necessary to make an appropriation for the maintenance of this park. In 1919 they actually expended on this national monument \$1,400. Now, it seemed to me that we were very liberal when we increased that appropriation to \$2,500.

Mr. WELLING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from Utah?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. WELLING. Of course, in other national parks we have expended as much as \$275,000.

Mr. GOOD. Oh, yes.

Mr. WELLING. And for this national park we are not asking a cent for roads, or improvements of that sort, but there were 10,000 or 12,000 people who visited the park area last year. It is away from any city two or three hundred miles. It needs police protection, and it is important, it seems to me, in view of the increased number of visitors that will be there next year, to provide this police protection.

Mr. GOOD. There are very few visitors to that park.

Mr. WELLING. I know there were not very many visitors to the park last year, but there will be a great many this year.

Mr. GOOD. I want to call attention to this fact: There is the Rocky Mountain National Park. When we first commenced to make appropriations for it in 1915, the first appropriation for that park of 254,000 acres was only \$3,000, and I think we are commencing very liberally in the appropriations for this park, especially at this time, when everything that is done in the way of improvements costs so much money. It was only intended to give it police protection and to postpone until the future and to a more normal condition the appropriation for improvements.

Mr. WELLING. The amount asked is \$10,000, to \$2,200 of which was to be for road improvement. I sympathize with the purpose of the gentleman, and I have purposely avoided asking for any money at all for improvements but just enough to give the necessary police protection.

Mr. GOOD. The department asked for \$150,000 for the Rocky Mountain Park, but we gave them only \$20,000, and with reference to this item under the circumstances I think the committee has done all that could be expected at this time.

Mr. CANNON. Is this park a recent creation, or has it stood there for all the ages?

Mr. GOOD. It was accepted as a national park by the act approved last November.

Mr. CANNON. But the scenery was there all the time, was it not?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, yes.

Mr. CANNON. Dating from Adam?

Mr. GOOD. I think so. [Laughter.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, these centers of recreation in the mountain regions are very interesting and it is a very nice thing for people to go to them and drink in the rare atmosphere that they boast of.

Mr. CALDWELL. Is there anything else that we have to drink?

Mr. MADDEN. That is about all. [Laughter.] But I want to call attention to the fact that while these men from those regions are asking increased appropriations that are not necessary at all, in every other section of the country where we have the business of the country to conduct we are endeavoring to assist in reducing appropriations in order that we may be able to keep the expenses of the Government within the revenues.

Take the Postal Service, for example. All the great cities of the United States have inadequate postal facilities, and the people in every one of these cities are clamoring for appropriations for added facilities, and they are justified in clamoring for such appropriations.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. The gentleman has just said that the people in the neighborhood where business is conducted and where there are business activities are clamoring for increased appropriations for the postal men. Am I right?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, no. I said for postal facilities—buildings and such things. We are asking also for increased salaries for the men, but we will cut that out of the present discussion.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Why cut it out?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not yield just now. I just wanted to illustrate—

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Will the gentleman answer one inquiry?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; I will answer an inquiry.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Then why does the gentleman—

Mr. MADDEN. I wanted to make a statement, but I will let the gentleman ask the question?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Why does the gentleman object?

Mr. MADDEN. I decline to yield for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to go on and make the statement that I was going to make.

These people who have been willing to make the sacrifice are getting along without the necessary facilities in order to help the country out of the national embarrassment which the country finds itself in; and yet these men coming from the mountain districts are demanding more money for playgrounds. We are compelled in the great city of Chicago and in all the other great cities of the United States to distribute the mail on the sidewalks because we have not the necessary building facilities to enable us to do the work as it ought to be done, and yet these sections of the country that pay no part of the great expenses of the Government send Representatives here who insist upon increased appropriations for things that are not necessary.

Now, I think that the men who are asking for these appropriations ought to begin to realize that they are a part of the United States and that if a panic comes as the result of the extravagant waste of public money, their people will realize it just as quickly as anybody else and they will suffer with the rest of us. Now, if we are willing to forego expenditures in our sections of the country, where we pay the bills—and these expenses are justified for legitimate Government reasons—these men ought to be willing to forego the right to demand appropriations for reasons that are not justified; and for one I propose to stand here in opposition, now and in the future, to all such appropriations as are demanded by these men from the Rocky Mountain districts for park purposes while the business of the country is embarrassed because of the inability of the Government to supply the needs, because it is believed that the people are already overburdened with taxation.

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds passed a resolution not long since to the effect that no public-building bill should be considered in this Congress, because they believed that the Government can not afford to make the appropriation. Now, everybody will agree that in all the great business centers of the country we need buildings in which to transact the public business, and the people there can not understand why they do not get them. When they are told about it they are glad to conform to the conditions in order to help out the situation. We want these men in these sparsely settled regions where there is nothing but ice and snow, as the gentleman from Oregon

[Mr. SINNOTT] has just told you, with which to regale the men who are about to visit that section of the country, to be sufficiently patriotic to join us in an effort to economize in order that the people of the country may be released from the burdens that are placed upon their backs by this excessive taxation.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. BLACK. I have listened with a great deal of interest and entire approval to the argument of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] for economy in Government expenditures. In the splendid argument that he made he referred to the condition of the Postal Service and to the need for increased facilities. While the gentleman was making his eloquent remarks I was forcibly reminded that there is now before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads what is known as the Fess bill, which has for its object the repealing of the third and fourth year rates of the zone postal law and the relieving of publishers whose publications are now being carried through the mails at much less than the actual cost of carrying them. Even at the maximum of rates provided in the present law the Government will be a heavy loser in the transportation of second-class mail matter.

The commission, headed by the distinguished jurist, Associate Justice Hughes, which a few years ago made a very exhaustive investigation of the cost of carrying second-class mail matter, reported to the Congress that it cost  $5\frac{1}{2}$  cents a pound to transport and distribute this class of mail matter, not including certain charges which were not allocated. It is admitted that the weight of second-class mail matter is more than a billion pounds a year, and that makes an annual cost to the Postal Service, conservatively estimated, of \$55,000,000, exclusive of certain overhead expenses. The rates at present in force produced only about \$15,000,000 the first year, will produce about \$22,000,000 the second year, \$27,000,000 the third year, and \$32,000,000 the fourth year, when they reach the peak of cost and remain permanent at that figure. That will leave us a loss on the carriage and distributing cost of carrying every pound of second-class matter. It will be a very substantial loss at that. Yet the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], the distinguished economist of the Republican side of the House, is leading the fight to report out a bill that would stop these rates at the second year and relieve publishers like the Curtis Publishing Co., whose publications are being carried through the mails at an estimated loss of at least \$4,000,000 a year to the Government. Mr. John C. Koons, in his testimony before the House Post Office Committee, stated some time ago that every issue of the Saturday Evening Post, even under the present rates, caused a loss to the Government of the United States of \$150,000. I have no fight to make on the Saturday Evening Post, but I am not in favor of the Government carrying it at such a heavy loss.

I agree that the postal employees ought to have better salaries and better wages, and I am wondering if the steering committee on the Republican side of the House are going to bring out a bill that will relieve the millionaire publishers instead of relieving the postal employees. If that is what you gentlemen are preparing to do, then we on this side of the House are ready to meet the issue. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moves that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be now closed.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. WELLING].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a new paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment as a new paragraph, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McKeown: Page 113, line 19, after the figures "\$2,500," insert a new paragraph, as follows: "That no sum appropriated herein for national parks shall be available for use of any park wherein any hotel or transportation company is permitted to charge unreasonable rates for accommodations."

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to take up the time of the committee to debate this amendment. It has come to my attention that in some of these parks the rates are so prohibitive that nobody except the ultra rich can stop there. These parks are for the accommodation of the entire public of the United States, and men of moderate means ought to be permitted to have some of the accommodations that go along with the beauties of the national parks.

Mr. CANNON. Are the rates fixed by the present law?

Mr. McKEOWN. I understand they are fixed by regulation.

Mr. CANNON. Then before they could use any of this money we would have to get somebody to determine what are reasonable rates, and before that could be done I suppose the season would pass by.

Mr. McKEOWN. The gentleman would not be in favor of permitting some hotel company or transportation company to charge unreasonable rates?

Mr. CANNON. Not at all; but we have no machinery to ascertain what is provided in the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. McKEOWN. I understand the Secretary of the Interior is charged with the duty of fixing the rate, and he ought not to permit them to charge unreasonable rates. If they are doing it, it ought to be called to his attention.

Mr. GOOD. I want to say to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKeown] that I have a good deal of confidence in the Secretary of the Interior. It is not only his right to fix these rates, but the law requires that he shall fix reasonable rates. I think we have a very able Secretary of the Interior, and I think we have one of the best and ablest park commissioners we have ever had.

Mr. McKEOWN. I agree to that part of it.

Mr. GOOD. And I am willing that they shall administer the law as it is upon the statute books. That law simply provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall prescribe reasonable rates. It has not been brought to the attention of the committee that any rates were unreasonable. There has been complaint that in order to bring about good accommodations, where we once had poor accommodations, where we had a whole lot of so-called competition and no service, a schedule of rates was fixed and a concession was given to one person, giving him the right to do certain things in the park and to perform certain services there. The service has been very greatly improved, but the cost of the service has not increased at all in comparison with the increased cost of labor.

Mr. McKEOWN. There has been considerable complaint about some of the charges in some of the western parks. Some people say they are absolutely prohibitive, and this amendment will regulate that matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKeown].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter members of the Board of United States General Appraisers may be allowed not to exceed \$7 per diem for expenses of subsistence actually incurred while traveling or engaged on official business at places other than the city of New York.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that paragraph. I notice that it provides \$7 per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence. My recollection is that the law provides \$5.

Mr. GOOD. That is correct. It is subject to a point of order.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield just a moment while I make a statement?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. This provision applies to the Board of General Appraisers, of whom there are nine. The gentleman will recollect that a former and esteemed colleague of ours is a member of that board. This board of appraisers and the attorneys who appear before them are required to make trips over the country for the purpose of hearing contested customs cases. Their duties take them to the larger cities. They do not visit any city except the larger cities.

The statement is made, and I am sure borne out by the facts, that it is absolutely impossible for them to get even a room in a hotel in the large cities for less than the amount of the per diem now allowed. Seven dollars would not pay the entire expense. As a matter of fact, the Board of General Appraisers think they ought to have the same per diem allowance as the Federal judges who hold court in the large cities. But the committee decided to increase it \$2, which, as I say, is not sufficient to pay all the expenses.

Mr. BLACK. I will state that the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads have had substantially the same complaint about the per diem allowance for post-office inspectors who do most of their work in the large cities. Probably we might have the same complaint all along the line. It seems to me that the equitable thing to do, if we are to increase the per diem allowance, is to take up the whole subject and provide for it by proper legislation.

I do not know any better paid officials in the Government service than this Board of General Appraisers. I know of some Government servants that are not nearly so well paid who are meeting worse difficulties than these officials.



Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman realizes that as a matter of fact the per diem which is provided for this board presents a different proposition from the per diem allowed for those who visit the smaller towns, where hotel expenses are not so great.

Mr. BLACK. I had that in mind. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman's point of order goes to the whole paragraph?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Detection and prosecution of crimes: For the detection and prosecution of crimes against the United States; the investigation of the official acts, records, and accounts of marshals, attorneys, clerks, referees, and trustees of the United States courts and the Territorial courts, and United States commissioners, for which purpose all the official papers, records, and dockets of said officers, without exception, shall be examined by the agents of the Attorney General at any time; for the protection of the person of the President of the United States; for such other investigations regarding official matters under the control of the Department of Justice or the Department of State as may be directed by the Attorney General; hire of motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles when necessary; per diem in lieu of subsistence when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, including not to exceed \$200,000 for necessary employees at the seat of government, and including a director of the Bureau of Investigation at not exceeding \$7,500 per annum, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General, \$2,000,000: *Provided*, That for the purpose of executing the duties for which provision is made by this appropriation, the Attorney General is authorized to appoint officials who shall be designated "special agents of the Department of Justice," and who shall be vested with the authority necessary for the execution of such duties: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for advances to be made by the disbursing clerk of the Department of Justice when authorized and approved by the Attorney General, the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the proviso beginning on line 18, page 119.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The reservation of a point of order is made, but the Chair will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make an inquiry relative to this service. As I understand, there is another department of the Government which has for its purpose the same work as this Bureau of Investigation. I would like to inquire of the chairman of the committee why it is that all of these departments can not be put under one division? Is it not true that a goodly part of these investigations are duplications?

Mr. GOOD. No; I do not think so. I suppose the gentleman refers to the department under the Treasury. Now, the department under the Treasury has to do with the question of counterfeiting, and that alone, practically. I think the only other function that that department performs is to furnish police protection for the President. This department is altogether different. It is true they carry on a detective service, but in this case they investigate practically all crimes committed against the United States except that of counterfeiting, and that is left to the Department of the Treasury, which confines its activities to that alone.

Mr. DOWELL. Is it not true that the Treasury Department does go outside of counterfeiting, and is it not true that before a prosecution is made it must be put up to an investigation by the Attorney General's office? Does it not finally come back to the Department of Justice to determine whether or not a crime has been committed?

Mr. GOOD. No; I think there is very little duplication. It is true that in the Customs Service there is some work carried on by the Treasury Department to prevent fraud against the Government. This is quite a different thing. This has to do with practically all of the criminal statutes of the United States.

Mr. DOWELL. They also have charge of investigating the same character of work that is carried on in the Treasury Department. For instance, if a crime is committed in counterfeiting, an investigation is or may be carried on by the Department of Justice in order to ascertain whether or not the crime has actually been committed.

Mr. GOOD. No; I think that is carried on by the Treasury Department.

Mr. DOWELL. My inquiry of the gentleman is whether or not it is not possible to put all this under one head so that the investigations may be made from one source instead of from different sources.

Mr. GOOD. I think that would be all right if there was any duplication, but if there is any duplication at all it is a very minor duplication. As I understand, the persons employed by Mr. Moran, of the Treasury Department, are only to make investigations along the line of counterfeiting and fraud on the

Customs Service. These persons employed by the Attorney General's department do not give their attention to those particular crimes, and the Attorney General only takes up the work when his office is called upon to prosecute, and then I think he accepts the findings and work of the Secret Service men.

Mr. DOWELL. In view of the fact that the Department of Justice must finally handle the case, would it not be better that all investigations should be made by the Department of Justice?

Mr. GOOD. In many cases investigations do not go to the extent of prosecution. They go to the extent sometimes of preventing crimes. If a person has been apprehended, then the work is taken over by the Attorney General, and the evidence is turned over to him, and I doubt very much if there is any lost motion in this.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. May I ask the gentleman from Iowa a question?

Mr. GOOD. Certainly.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. In the proviso the Attorney General is authorized to appoint officials who shall be designated "special agents of the Department of Justice." How are these officials now designated?

Mr. GOOD. These officials are known as operators, and without a special designation. As I recall, the statement was made that they did not have the authority to carry firearms. A person who is designated as a special agent of the Department of Justice as provided in the paragraph under the law would be authorized to carry firearms. The Attorney General feels that these persons should be protected; that they should go out with some protection in the way of firearms. That was the reason for including this provision.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. This provision says "and who shall be vested with the authority necessary for the execution of such duties." I do not know just what "such duties" may be, but by general terms to give employees of the Government authority to do anything they please is making it pretty broad.

Mr. GOOD. The Attorney General has this to say:

Mr. PALMER. Under the statutes as they now exist, my understanding is that the special agents have no status whatsoever. It is a title that has been given under the administration of the department, and as an instance of that, an agent has no authority to carry a firearm. It is only by the courtesy of the States that they are allowed to carry any firearms. If a State official, a sheriff or any other State official, wants to prosecute one of the agents of our department, he can do so for carrying a concealed weapon. It is only in the District here that they are allowed to carry one, and this clause was inserted with that in view—to give them an official status and the same rank as a Secret Service operator under the Treasury Department.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The fact is that the country is burdened with special agents of various departments, and when a man goes into a place seeking to exercise some authority which, perhaps, he ought not to exercise, and presents a card as special agent of the Department of Justice, and says that Congress has given him all of the authority he needs for the execution of any duty that he chooses to attempt to perform, it resolves itself into nothing more than a method of intimidation.

Mr. MACCRATE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, it has been suggested that some of these secret agents in New York City have been putting prisoners through the third degree even more cruel than anything heretofore experienced in the city of New York. I wonder if "such duties" would include the third degree.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. This would give them all of the authority they thought was necessary for the execution of any duties that the Department of Justice chose to give them to perform, apparently without any limitation. It is the broadest language that I recall in any statutory provision of law. I am personally rather tired of the complaints, whether they be justified or not, of so many people about the constant visits they have from various special agents of the different departments of the Government.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have given the gentleman all of the light that I have on the subject, and when the Attorney General asked for this, in view of the very critical situation throughout the country at the present time, the committee did not feel warranted in declining to give that authority.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. While, perhaps, the Attorney General may be justified in all that he asks, I am not in favor of letting agents of the Department of Justice arrest anyone they please on any kind of a suspicion that they may have, and say that Congress has given them authority to do it. They probably would not arrest the gentleman from Iowa and probably not myself, although it is not unlikely that they might summon either one of us and put us under examination. I think it would be well to have this matter considered in the Senate. If the Senate choose to insert it, then it can be considered in conference, where probably it will get more investigation than it would if the item went into the bill to the Senate. I make the

point of order against the proviso, beginning on line 18 and ending with line 23, page 119.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order against the proviso in line 18 and ending with line 23, on page 119. The Chair thinks the proviso is legislation and sustains the point of order.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the word "further," after the word "Provided," in line 23, page 119.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 23, page 119, strike out the word "further."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the bill, on line 17, page 119, by striking out "\$2,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "\$2,500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Page 119, line 17, strike out the figures "\$2,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$2,500,000."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, if it be adopted, will carry for the next year the appropriation now made for the Department of Justice for the purpose set forth in this paragraph, lacking \$100,000. In other words, the appropriation for the current year carries for the detection and prosecution of crime the sum of \$2,600,000. When the estimates were submitted the Department of Justice asked for \$3,500,000 for that purpose. When the Attorney General appeared before the committee he stated that he realized the necessity for economy and that he was anxious himself to see economy practiced. Therefore, he voluntarily withdrew from his estimates \$1,000,000, and stated that if the Congress would give him \$2,500,000 for the next year he hoped to be able to get along. He now has a force or organization based on an expenditure at the rate of \$2,600,000 per year. If you adopt the provision carried in the bill, then you will reduce the organization on July 1 by the sum of \$500,000.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. What is the force of the Department of Justice now, in number?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I could not tell the gentleman that without referring to the hearings. I will look it up and let the gentleman know later. As has been stated, this sum is for the detection and prosecution of all crimes under the United States statutes. The Attorney General says that at least 40 per cent of the sum will be used in the campaign against the alien radicals and the anarchists in this country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. What is to be gained by employing a large number of special agents to make arrests on information and belief against aliens suspected of violating the anarchistic clauses of the immigration laws when we are unable to deport them?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is an entirely different proposition.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It has a lot to do with it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The Department of Justice, as the gentleman knows, has nothing to do with the decision of those cases, and I submit that merely because another department has failed, if that be the case, to take action on the cases that are put up to it, is no reason why we should deny to the Department of Justice the amount necessary to run down these radicals and anarchists and put them up to the proper party for decision.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Permit me to put a proposition to the gentleman: We want the laws sustained, and while I have no desire to criticize one department more than another—or, in fact, any department—yet if we must do it we may as well make the criticism. The overloading of the jails is never good. Now, the organizer of these Department of Justice raids, if he had thought about it a minute, would have known that the number of arrests would be beyond the capacity of another department of the Government to quickly take up and investigate the arrests.

If we have too many special agents employed for the purpose of probing and finding out, they will keep on making those arrests, and aliens will be put into jail much faster than the Immigration Service can take care of them. The increase of appropriation is proposed in the wrong place. Let the sum be

appropriated for additional immigration inspectors, who can prepare cases and evidence against revolutionary aliens.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Well, if the Department of Justice through its special agents is engaged in arresting those who are guilty of an infraction of our laws or inciting rebellion or undertaking to injure the Government or seeking to destroy it by force and violence, merely because some other department is not able to proceed as rapidly as it ought possibly to do—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Or as rapidly as arrests are made.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Or as rapidly as the guilty parties are detected and arrested, that is no reason why we should deny the Department of Justice the full complement of investigators necessary to make those investigations. You would not stop the running down and arresting of thieves or murderers merely because the courts could not dispose of the cases as rapidly as they were brought before them. Why make a distinction in the case of any violators of the law? Now, what are you doing by reducing this appropriation? You are serving notice upon the alien radicals and anarchists of this country who would use force and violence that we are reducing the organization of the Department of Justice, which was formed for the purpose of running them down and bringing them to book and sending them back to where they belong in the event they are found guilty. I do not think this Congress can afford at this particular time to take the position of cutting the organization of the Department of Justice 20 per cent during the next fiscal year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. But notice to that effect has been served both through acts of the Department of Labor and through certain—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I remember to have noticed a statement in the Washington papers quoting the gentleman himself, as chairman of the Committee on Immigration, in a hearing before the Committee on Rules, as very highly commending the Department of Justice for all that had been done, and stating—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I ask that the gentleman from Tennessee have five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Now, if he commends what it has done up to this time, it seems to me that he must agree that when we undertake to cut down the appropriations beginning July 1 and reduce that organization we are doing something that we ought not to do, for we are depriving the Attorney General of the machinery necessary to carry out the law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If the gentleman will permit, what I said the other day before the Rules Committee was that in my opinion the Department of Justice had performed a great service in the United States in breaking up a conspiracy. Now, we have had some rulings since the arrests were made. We find, through the rulings of the Secretary of Labor, that the alien members of the Communist Party are deportable for membership; that alien members of the Communist Labor Party are not deportable except for individual overt acts; and alien members of the Russian Workers' Union are deportable for membership; and that alien members of the I. W. W. are not deportable except for overt acts. Now, you will not have to have a great number of special agents trying to classify revolutionary aliens and others, because they will all know enough to get out of the Communist Party into these other parties.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I understand the gentleman stands for an amendment of the laws so as to make them more stringent?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I do so.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The Attorney General stated that the work of the department was becoming more difficult day by day for this reason; these alien radicals and anarchists, who are of course subject to deportation, are now standing in the background—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Dodging and denying.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And dodging, as the gentleman says, and permitting citizens who have like radical tendencies and ideas to take the lead in these matters. Now, of course, it is as much the duty of the Attorney General to ferret out crime on the part of citizens as of aliens.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Although he complains—and I think complains very properly—that he has not sufficient authority under the law to enable him to effectively punish citizens guilty of such offenses. He has asked Congress for such legislation, but it has failed to give it to him. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to another fact. The appropria-



tion as carried under this paragraph is not confined alone to this particular crime. I stated awhile ago that probably 40 per cent of it is used for the purpose to which the gentleman has alluded. In addition to that, it is made the duty of the Attorney General to prosecute all crimes upon the calendar and these special agents are engaged in detecting crime of all kinds.

Mr. VARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VARE. Will my colleague state to the committee how much of this fund was used for the investigation of the election offenses in Michigan?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. My recollection is that the sum of \$40,000 was so expended, but there were fines amounting to \$45,000 assessed in that case.

Mr. GOOD. If the gentleman will permit, I think at the time of the hearings the trial of that case had not concluded.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. My statement is based on information given me since that time.

Mr. MacCRATE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. MacCRATE. Can the gentleman inform the committee how many men were arrested as the result of May day activities?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman means—

Mr. MacCRATE. Those of May 1.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I can not; no.

Mr. MacCRATE. Has the gentleman any idea how many persons were taken?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not know whether any were arrested or not.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will yield.

Mr. McKEOWN. Does this amount allowed here include what is necessary to investigate the profiteering in the necessities of life?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. What per cent will be allowed for that?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The Attorney General stated that if allowed \$2,000,000, a million of it would be expended in the detection and prosecution of the alien radicals and anarchists; that \$1,100,000 of it would be expended for the detection and prosecution of all other crimes against the United States; and that \$500,000 of it would be used in the campaign against the high cost of living and the prosecution of profiteers.

Mr. McKEOWN. Does not the gentleman think in view of the charges made against the Attorney General that he is not trying to reduce the high cost of living, he ought to have sufficient funds?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I certainly do, and if this money is not appropriated for him and he is not given the money he asks from Congress, and especially since he asks no more for next year than he has had this year, then I think those who vote against it are estopped from making any criticism against the Department of Justice for not reducing the high cost of living or from offering any complaint if all these laws are not fully enforced. The Attorney General has fearlessly done his duty. He has done it in the face of criticism from those who are guilty of violating our laws, and Congress can do no less, it seems to me, than supply him with the necessary funds to carry on this work and thereby serve notice not only on the radicals and anarchists but also upon the profiteers and other law violators that Congress intends to stand behind him and back him up to the limit in his effort to enforce the law. [Applause.]

Mr. MacCRATE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This bill carries an appropriation for books for the Department of Justice. It seems to me among those books there should be the Constitution of the United States, the Federalist, and a copy of the Revised Statutes of the United States, for I do not believe that outside of the Department of Justice there is such ignorance of the limitation of the powers of that department as there exists in the department.

No radical leader in this generation has done more to unsettle the nerves of the American people than has the Attorney General. He has awakened class antagonism to greater pitch than any preacher of class warfare. He borrows the bitterest terms of denunciation and hurls them indiscriminately here and there and elsewhere at portions of our people. Whenever the country seems ready to settle down and the national nerves are about normal, he breaks out, crying, "The Republic is endangered." Other men cry out for the repeal of war-time legislation. His voice utters a demand that we must not let war-time legislation die with the coming of peace. He failed to prosecute a

single profiteer from January to June, 1919, under war-time legislation, yet in savage language sought to arouse the American people against Congress to turn their indignation from himself.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MacCRATE. Not just yet.

In 1919, at Albany, N. Y., he proclaimed himself the David ready to slay the Goliath who threatened the American table. He declared that the "wrath of the American people will compel a verdict of conviction" of the packers. Yet in 1920 he cloisters himself with counsel for the packers and permits them to withdraw unharmed from the criminal courts. No man wants innocent men, of large or small means, unjustly convicted, but what did the Attorney General mean to do when he trumpeted to the country his opinion that their wrath would demand conviction of the packers? If the packers committed no crime, why seek to stir the wrath of our people against them? If they did commit crime, why permit them to go free while others must be imprisoned?

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not talking in order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. MacCRATE. I submit that this is in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman has prepared a set speech on this subject, and he ought to get it out of his system. It hurts.

Mr. MacCRATE. The gentleman from Texas does not think what he is going to say, but the gentleman from New York does think.

Mr. BLANTON. What the gentleman from Texas does think and say is in order and to the point.

Mr. MacCRATE. Surely it is a strange sight to witness an Attorney General crying for convictions on wrath and not on evidence.

Have constitutional guaranties become so obsolete that impartial justice is an impossibility for our citizens? Is suspicion to supplant facts in the conduct of the affairs of government?

We will never get back to normal while the chief law officer of the country proceeds in violation of constitutional and statutory principles and everlastingly arouses the people to suspect each other. There are, as there always have been, bad men among us. If the Attorney General will get them and rightly put them in jail, we will be able to count them with certainty, but we will never know their number as long as their only place of confinement is the mind of the Attorney General.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MacCRATE. Shortly.

The American people are tired of talk about the existence of hundreds of thousands of dangerous profiteers and overthrowers of Government while a baker's dozen only find their way to a place of punishment.

Our Attorney General has become a general adviser to the housewives of America. Daily for months he has told the good women of America what to cook, when to cook, what to wear, and when to wear, what to buy and when to buy.

He tells our wives and mothers how to make chuck taste like sirloin and how to be satisfied with old-fashioned gingham instead of new silks. He warns them to beware of demanding too many styles of clothing in one season. For the top of the head and the sole of the foot, for outer garments and inner needs, our indefatigable Attorney General has a daily suggestion. Surely we who have seen Sunday's noonday meal come on the table in a new dress on Monday, Tuesday, and sometimes on Wednesday know that our women folks need no assistance from a Federal officeholder on the art of making Sunday's delicious roast beef Wednesday's delightful hash. We who have watched feathers and flowers transposed and transplanted to make the old hat look like new, and who have seen a dress of three seasons made modern and fit for the fourth, recommend to the Attorney General that he take from rather than give advice to the American housewife.

Where in the Revised Statutes does our learned Attorney General read that he should advise as to the food, the drink, and the clothing of the American people? By what authority does he join with the packers in recommending "cheap cuts" to the American public? The Revised Statutes lay down the duties and powers of the Department of Justice. They provide for "men learned in the law" to advise the President, the various executive departments, and to prosecute actions in the courts of the country.

If we are going to convert the Department of Justice into a department of household economy, let us put at the head of the department one of the millions of American mothers who has

been transforming dad's trousers into son's pants while the Attorney General has been trying mightily to make presidential garments out of the official clothes he now wears.

Now, I am ready to yield.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I wondered—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask that the gentleman may be given one more minute, in order that he may answer a pointed question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I wonder if the gentleman from New York can tell the House just how many arrests and how many convictions have been made by the Department of Justice under the food-control act?

Mr. MACCRATE. I have been endeavoring to get that. I introduced a resolution in this House myself asking specifically as between January 1 and June 30, 1919, and the Attorney General himself responded that there was not a solitary conviction in the whole United States.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am not asking the gentleman for any specific period of time.

Mr. MACCRATE. That is the only period for which I have asked.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman has delivered a set speech, in which he has vigorously denounced the Attorney General and accused the Attorney General of not complying with his obligation as an officer of the United States. Now, I want to know whether or not the gentleman has information as to just what the Attorney General has done under the act of which he complains?

Mr. MACCRATE. All I know is that the Attorney General has promised to put every profiteer in jail, and there have been only about two dozen put in jail.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. How many arrests under the food-control act, and do you know how many convictions?

Mr. MACCRATE. Assuming that the number of arrests is great, then the Attorney General is more blameworthy if there are so few in jail.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLANTON. Does not the gentleman know that within the last 90 days the Attorney General has apprehended about 6,000 anarchists and that just the other day Louis F. Post, Assistant Secretary of Labor, testified before the Committee on Rules that he used to be a loyal Republican, yet the country knows he has turned most of these 6,000 anarchists loose on the people of America? Louis F. Post, and not the Attorney General of the United States, is wholly responsible for the law not being applied to the infamous anarchists now menacing the United States.

How is he going to reconcile that state of affairs with his speech?

Mr. MACCRATE. Well, if those 6,000 exist in the same place that the bomb throwers of May 1 existed, there are not any. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, if it had not been for the action taken by the Attorney General there would probably have been some of them throwing bombs in this House from the gallery yonder.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request? There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes—5 minutes to be used by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NEWTON], 5 minutes by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], and 5 minutes by myself.

Mr. McKEOWN. I would like to have 5 minutes.

Mr. GOOD. Then I make it 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, to be divided as indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I would like to know how much of this 20 minutes is to be divided among those defending the good name of one of the Cabinet officers of the land, which has just been brought into disrepute.

Mr. GOOD. I hope the debate will be confined to the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Then none of it will be used to offset some of the attacks that have been made upon him on the floor.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. You could not divide up time in that way.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] two questions in connection with the appropriation for the office of the Attorney General. Some time ago, as has been mentioned here in the debates, there were a large number of arrests of aliens, belonging to the Communist Party. It is contended by the Department of Labor that many of these men were merely nominal members of the party and did not know the obligations that they had subscribed to.

It also appears that the Attorney General's office—the Department of Justice—did not arrest and did not apprehend men who were the leaders in this Communist Party movement, but that the arrests were made merely of the rank and file, many of whom, it is claimed, were entirely ignorant of the details of the principles of the Communist Party. Can the gentleman give the House any information as to that, and the reason for not arresting and apprehending the leaders of this Communist Party movement?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I know that warrants were issued chiefly for leaders and officers and persons in responsible positions in those organizations which were formed for the purpose of promoting the revolutionary movement in the United States in their various meetings and organizations. Now, if it be true that some of them were not apprehended, it was because the officers were unable to locate or find them.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Well, I have been informed that men who are in the country to-day, men who are speaking for the Communist Party to-day, were not arrested or apprehended, and no warrants were ever issued for their arrest.

Mr. BOX. Will the gentleman name some of those leaders?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Louis C. Fraina was the name of one of the leaders that was given to me. I understand he has not been apprehended, but I have no information other than hearsay.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I have no information as to any particular individual case, but I do know that the Attorney General and those who appeared before the committee positively stated that these warrants of arrest were directed against the officers and responsible leaders of the revolutionary organizations. The Attorney General went at some length into the organization of the Communist and Communist Labor Parties, and into the platforms or teachings of the two parties, in order to show just how they were fomenting trouble and promoting a movement to injure and, if possible, overturn the Government by force and violence, and he stated that warrants were issued against the officers, those in charge of their various meetings and organizations. Now, if it be that some particular leader was not arrested, I have no information concerning it.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Now, can the gentleman tell me anything about the fair-price committees working under the Department of Justice here in the District of Columbia? I read the other day that under the auspices of the Department of Justice the fair-price committee had fixed as a fair rate of profit for a retailer upon a pair of shoes selling for about \$12, 33½ or 35 per cent upon the selling price. That would mean at least 50 per cent profit upon the cost of the shoes to the retailer, and that statement, I understand, is true. Now, can it be that, with appropriations going to the Department of Justice for the prevention of profiteering, that department is approving a profit of that kind upon a staple article like a pair of shoes—a nonperishable article, which, if not sold to-day can be sold to-morrow or a year from to-day?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman knows that the fair-price committee was simply an organization which was perfected in the various cities of the land for the purpose of assisting the Department of Justice to bear down the high cost of living.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman further knows that a year ago, possibly, the Attorney General requested this Congress to enact certain legislation by way of amendment to the Lever food-control act which would give him the authority to go into the courts and prosecute criminally and put into jail the profiteers who are reaping such enormous profits at the expense of the people of this country, and this Congress for months failed to give him the legislation he asked for—



Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Yes; and why should we do that when he O. K's and approves an exorbitant price upon the sale at retail of a pair of shoes such as I have indicated? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Oh, everyone knows that the Attorney General does not approve it.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that this matter seems to partake of a political aspect as to this appropriation. This question is really not a political question. It ought not to be dealt with by Congress as a political question. The Attorney General of the United States is a fearless officer, and I want to say to you that a man upon whom the reds have made such a vicious attack in trying to kill him is not one that the Congress of the United States ought now to lie down upon when it comes to providing means for the enforcement of the law. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is the duty of the Attorney General to execute the law, and it is the duty of the Congress to pass sufficient laws and give him enough money with which to enforce the law and not to criticize him. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If the Congress would give him more help and less criticism he would make more progress in the reduction of the high cost of living.

The high cost of living has been dragged in as a political issue, and it has been used as a platform upon which to get into office.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Does the gentleman refer to the campaign of 1912?

Mr. McKEOWN. I refer to the campaign of 1918. [Laughter.] It has been used to get into office with. The question of the high cost of living has been made a political issue when every sane man knows that you can not reduce the high cost of living by legislation. The reduction of the high cost of living has got to come by increasing the supply of necessities and the prevention of hoarding.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Does the gentleman think, however, that Congress ought to sit silent with the approval by the Department of Justice of a profit of 50 per cent on the cost of a pair of shoes?

Mr. McKEOWN. I do not know whether the gentleman's statement of it is correct—

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I can assure the gentleman that it is correct.

Mr. McKEOWN. But Congress is not here to approve or disapprove of the particular amounts or percentages allowed in particular cases without all the facts in the case. But there is this much that I do know, and that is that Congress is interested in bringing shoes within the reach of the people, and that the Attorney General ought to have the money with which to enforce the law, and it is the duty of Congress to give it to him.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman tell us what law there is now on the statute books to prevent a profit of 50 per cent on shoes?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. He has the Lever food-control act.

Mr. BLANTON. In what way would that enable the Attorney General to stop profiteering on shoes?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. It provides for the fixing of a reasonable price, and if he would enforce it we would have something like reasonable prices.

Mr. McKEOWN. Here is the attitude you gentlemen on the Republican side have taken: In one breath you condemn the Attorney General because he does not reduce the high cost of living and in the next you oppose an appropriation to enforce the law. We ought to give him sufficient funds to let him try to the full extent to put the red anarchists out of this country and to put the profiteers in jail, and you ought to give him full authority and plenty of money with which to do it, and not go out to the country and say, "If you put me in power, I will immediately reduce the high cost of living," or go out to the country and say, "You have got an Attorney General who does not enforce the law," when you do not give him the money with which to enforce it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Of course, the gentleman understands that, as far as deporting reds is concerned, I contend that the \$1,700,000 that the Attorney General proposes to use is as much as can be used with the machinery in the other departments?

Mr. McKEOWN. I understand the gentleman from Washington has been all the time advocating the deportation of those people and criticizing one of the other departments because they have not deported them or passed on them for their deportation.

I hold no brief for the Attorney General as to the fair-price committees. I believe in less investigations and more prosecutions.

Give the Attorney General sufficient funds to bring the rich profiteer to the bar of justice and for the apprehension of anarchists in America and if he fails then you can justly criticize him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I am not surprised that the Attorney General should have met with some criticism from some sources over the country. Any man who has the duty and responsibility of enforcing penal statutes, or statutes that affect the pocketbooks of the great interests of this country, can expect always to meet with a certain amount of criticism if he does his duty. But I do not think there is anyone who can fairly and justly say that the present Attorney General of the United States has not used his authority and the authority of his department and the appropriations given him by Congress to enforce the laws upon our statute books to the very best of his splendid ability. [Applause.] Gentlemen complain because he has not reduced the price of shoes. I want to ask gentlemen why it is that they have not complied with the request of the President to enact a statute which will give to the Attorney General and to the Department of Justice the power to enforce some of these statutes and to put some of these people in jail and at the same time give publicity to some of these immense profits that are being made, because you will recall that the request has been made of Congress that statutes be enacted providing that the manufacturers' prices of these articles be stamped upon them, so that when the consumer buys them from the retailer he will know exactly what profit is being made. Yet this Congress, in the face of that request of the President, which has been made more than once in the past year, has remained inactive and has failed to take action upon his request. I say it comes with poor grace for us to stand here and undertake to criticize the Attorney General, charged as he is with the duty of enforcing the laws of the United States, and then deny to him the amount of money which he says is necessary to enable him to enforce those laws. On the contrary, it is proposed here to deny him the amount of money that he now has for the enforcement of these laws and to cut down his appropriation for the next year 20 per cent from what was allowed for the current year.

I say that if we do that we are estopped from uttering any criticism of the Attorney General in the future if he should fail in any degree in his efforts to enforce these particular laws.

Gentlemen have asked what the Attorney General has done under the food control act. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MacCRATE] a few moments ago delivered a set speech criticizing the Attorney General for what the gentleman claimed he had failed to do under that act. But in response to a question the gentleman was unable to give the House any information as to the action taken by the Department of Justice.

Mr. MacCRATE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Just a moment. I will tell the gentleman what he does not seem to know. As a matter of fact, under that law 1,173 arrests were made, and more than 125 convictions have been secured in various parts of this country. Gentlemen know how difficult it is to secure a conviction in a criminal prosecution when you go before a jury in a man's home town, when you indict some profiteer who stands well in his community, and place him before a jury of 12 men in that particular community. But I submit that the record shows that the Department of Justice, through the district attorneys and agents all over this country, has been vigorous in the prosecution of all those who have been charged with violating that act as well as every criminal statute, and I want to appeal to you now not to cut down the Attorney General's force for next year, but to give him his investigators, give him every special agent he says he needs.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing a statement showing just what the Department of Justice has done in this direction. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to is as follows:

MAY 6, 1920.

In re appropriation for detection and prosecution of crimes, fiscal year commencing July 1, 1920.

I understand the fact to be, although I am not certain about it, that as the sundry civil bill now stands the sum of \$2,000,000 has been appropriated for detection and prosecution of crimes.

The expenses of the bureau are now running at a figure of approximately \$3,000,000 per year.



On March 9 I furnished you with a memorandum in which I stated that about \$2,500,000 would be sufficient for the bureau for the next fiscal year. Since that time, however, several things have come to my attention which indicate that such sum will not be sufficient.

The additional facts, exclusive of those bearing upon the question of the high cost of living, may be summarized under two headings:

(A) THE BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION IS MORE THAN SELF-SUPPORTING.

1. In the Seattle Shipyard case, investigation whereof was commenced at the request of the Shipping Board, 12 men, at an average salary of \$7 per day plus \$4 per day and traveling expenses, were engaged from October 1 to date, at an estimated total expense of around \$30,000. This investigation produced bona fide claims in favor of the Government in civil action amounting to \$415,000 and produced facts upon which the Government is stopping payment of claims already allowed in the additional amount of \$4,240,000. It is anticipated that most, if not all, of this amount will be saved for the Government. The financial results to the United States Government in this case alone more than pays the operation expenses of the Bureau of Investigation for the entire fiscal year. In addition thereto, indictments have been found against 25 or more defendants as a result of this investigation.

2. In another case, the name whereof must remain confidential, inasmuch as indictments have not yet been presented by the grand jury, bona fide claims in favor of the Government in the amount of \$326,000 have been disallowed. It is also expected that a number of indictments will result.

3. In another case of the same nature, and likewise confidential, claims have been disallowed by one of the Government departments in the amount of \$42,000 upon evidence produced by the bureau, and two indictments are expected to follow.

4. In another case \$25,000 in claims were disallowed by another Government department on evidence produced by the bureau.

5. From and after the first of the year the activities of the anti-trust division became revived, although prior to that time they amounted to practically nothing. At present there are 90 antitrust cases proceeding and facts have come to the attention of the department that show that at least 100 more investigations of that nature are awaiting the attention of the bureau. We have 20 special anti-trust agents operating from the bureau whose entire time is taken up in such investigations and the time of at least 20 more with their per diems and traveling expenses are constantly being used to further such investigations. Only a small number of these cases have been brought to a final conclusion as yet, but the amount of fines collected, in addition to the good effect of securing indictments in this class of cases, will amount to a very large figure, certainly more than enough to pay the expenses of the investigations themselves, and it is not impossible that such fines in the total will pay considerable, if not all, of the entire expense of the bureau. In one recent case a fine of \$25,000 was imposed and collected.

6. Investigations of fraudulent claims against the Bureau of War Risk Insurance are now producing an income of in excess of \$1,500 per month. The saving in regards to such frauds by the publicity attending indictments and exposures is probably much greater.

7. Our bank accountants are constantly collecting fines against individuals in addition to the penitentiary sentences they are securing.

8. We have no statistics showing the amount of fines collected in miscellaneous matters upon convictions obtained by the activities of the Bureau of Investigation. One item may be taken as illustrative of the amount recovered. On liquor cases arising under the then existing statutes prior to January 1, 1920, a casual examination of the reports of agents show that \$147,000 was collected in fines. These reports were not made for this purpose and are not at all complete. Mr. Keep, who directs this line of investigation, assures me that it does not represent more than one-half of the total amount of fines collected throughout the United States in liquor cases.

(B) UNANTICIPATED BURDENS UPON THE APPROPRIATION.

1. Legislation enforcing national prohibition did not come into effect until January of this year, and it was some time thereafter that the Treasury Department succeeded in organizing its force so as to deal with this matter without our assistance. A more or less heavy burden, though decreasing burden, has been placed upon the bureau by reason of such fact. There are a large number of liquor investigations that the bureau can not escape. They involve cases wherein the district attorney requests additional help from the bureau in cases which are about to be tried; cases of emergency, where no prohibition agent is available; and cases involving the integrity of the prohibition agents. From this it will be seen that the most important of the prohibition cases are still a burden upon the bureau.

2. As hereinabove stated, the antitrust work has grown beyond any possible expectation due to several factors, among them being the natural profiteering tendency arising subsequent to the war, the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the steel case, and the attitude of the Federal Trade Commission in referring more and more of these cases to the Department of Justice for action. As above stated, there are about 190 cases at present demanding the attention of the department which will involve the activities of about 40 agents for the rest of this year and all of the succeeding fiscal year.

3. The election fraud cases, among them being the famous Newberry case, likewise added a heavy burden. It is estimated that the Newberry case cost the Bureau of Investigation about \$40,000. In this connection, however, I wish to add that fines to the amount of \$45,000 were assessed.

4. The investigation of the Seattle Shipyard produced such good results that the Shipping Board desire like investigations to be made in a number of other cases which it is hoped will produce substantial results, although such investigations will necessarily deplete the bureau's appropriation.

5. The War Department has issued bulletins requesting the public to make report of such violations of the selective-service act as comes to their attention. The regulations authorizing these bulletins are recent in origin and are throwing a heavy burden upon the bureau which could not be anticipated. We have heretofore investigated 200,000 of such cases, 40,000 whereof are shown to have a criminal aspect and indictments are expected. We are obtaining from 15 to 20 convictions a day throughout the United States in this class of cases. I estimate that there will be 100,000 additional of these investigations to be made by the bureau resulting from the action of the War Department.

6. The gradual increase in cost of living has made it necessary for us to meet demands for increased salaries. We have made such in-

creases where possible but our better men are constantly leaving us because of their inability to receive compensation in a Government position commensurate with their ability. It is not uncommon for men to leave our bureau and receive a salary of from two to three times the salary paid by the Government. These increases are, however, an additional burden. The increase in the number of investigations demanding the services of expert accountants and agents well informed on business affairs makes it necessary for us to consider a larger increase in salaries of men engaged in that line of work if we are to keep them in the Government employ. At present rates we are losing our best men. This situation can only be met by giving such men commensurate salaries for such services.

7. The act of Congress making it a crime to transport stolen automobiles across State lines has become to be more of a burden upon the bureau than was anticipated. We have obtained up to date convictions in over 160 of such cases.

8. When the railroads were turned back to private ownership there were a large number of investigations arising out of stolen shipments in interstate commerce. Prior to that time these investigations were made by the railroad police. Since that time, although the investigators of the private lines are of great assistance, there is nevertheless an increased burden upon the bureau of investigation.

9. The appropriations of the War and Navy Departments for investigative purposes having been exhausted, we are under constant pressure to complete investigations they have commenced but are unable to complete or to take up new ones they have been unable to undertake, particularly regarding thefts of Government property in and about camps and shipyards. This was an unanticipated and considerable burden upon the bureau.

10. The expenses of the radical division have continued at their high mark since before the first of the year, and there have been some rather unusual expenses in connection therewith incident to the raids upon the Union of Russian Workers, the Communist Party, and the Communist Labor Party. Upward of 25 per cent of the activities of the bureau are on radical matters. The situation in this regard, however, is not different from what I have anticipated, but is perhaps different from what Congress or the public may understand the facts to be.

11. Congress has recently passed a resolution requesting the investigation of all military camps and cantonments with respect to any fraudulent claims growing out of their construction or otherwise. Several investigations of this nature have been made in the past, including that of the Air Nitrates Corporation at Muscle Shoals. There are 32 such camps and cantonments, and our best estimate, based upon expenses in similar investigations heretofore incurred, would make the cost of the investigation called for by said resolution amount to somewhere around \$3,000,000.

If the bureau is to be expected to go into this thing as the resolution calls for, a special appropriation covering such matters ought to be made by Congress; otherwise we can not be expected to do more than a very small part of such work without seriously interfering with the bureau's other activities.

12. The passport-control act, which extended the powers of the State Department upon the granting of passports and permits to leave the United States, has shown an increase in the requests for information upon individuals concerned from a comparatively few up to the present figure in excess of 2,000 a day. Most of these requests, however, do not require field investigation, but each requires an examination of the files of the bureau. Field investigations, however, are frequently made at the request of the State Department.

13. The fact that we have not yet arrived at peace with the Central Powers of Europe has thrown a very heavy unanticipated burden upon the bureau in making the investigations necessary to recommend the exception from the classification of alien enemy for naturalization purposes. The law does not permit us to make such recommendations until an investigation is made. Every German or Austrian who had previously taken out his first papers and who now desires his second papers is applying to the bureau to have an investigation made so that his naturalization may not be delayed any longer. Over 7,000 of such applications have been made since the first of the year, which is larger than the entire number of such applications made prior thereto. About 2,500 of such investigations have been conducted since the first of the year. It will be remembered that a personal investigation and interview of the applicant and his witnesses and a written report is necessary in every case.

The activities in this regard will cease immediately upon the declaration of peace. However, the time when peace will be declared is problematical, and until such time we will be burdened with at least 3,000 to 4,000 such investigations.

14. The Mexican situation has been an increasing burden upon the bureau, and particularly in view of the fact that for lack of appropriation the Immigration Service along the border has been suspended. It has been necessary for us to increase the number of agents along the Mexican border.

15. I have not included any observation on the high cost of living, which I understand Mr. Figg's organization has covered by a special memorandum. For your information, however, the actual number of reports received from our field agents when distributed show that 15 per cent of such reports are upon cost-of-living investigations. When it is considered that such investigations are necessarily laborious and complicated, it will readily be understood that this percentage does not express the true relation of such activities to the other activities of the bureau. No accurate statistics are available, but the cost-of-living investigations are a burden of approximately 25 per cent of the entire appropriation.

Of course, that proportion that may be expended at the seat of government should bear a correct ratio with that which will be expended in the field. It seems to me that it would not be out of the way to be permitted to expend 10 per cent of the appropriation at Washington, although that may be considered a little bit high in case of a large appropriation, but would not be considered high in case of a small appropriation, because of the disproportionate demands made by Government departments upon the bureau officials at Washington regarding the contents of our confidential files and the well-recognized rule that overhead expense is always larger in proportion where the investment is small.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I think we should approach this subject with a full realization of what we have done and what it is proposed to do. The last Congress, a Congress in sympathy politically with the Attorney General, reported out this bill, which carried a similar item of \$1,600,000 for this very



purpose. Later, in the present Congress, the Attorney General made an estimate for a deficiency of a million dollars, and in presenting the matter before the Committee on Appropriations, he said that the money would be expended largely in prosecution of the red element in this country, or running down the reds, and in the prosecution of the profiteers and in reducing the high cost of living. Congress gave him every penny that he asked for—\$1,000,000—more than the last Congress gave him.

Now, I am perfectly willing to appropriate, so far as I am individually concerned, all the money necessary for the Attorney General's office. But I want to make this observation, without any tinge of partisanship: To-day the Attorney General is spending \$1,600,000 which we appropriated for arresting, for deportation, the alien radical element which has found shelter and protection in this country. Over 6,000 warrants have been issued and the arrests amount to approximately 3,500 persons. The persons arrested last January by the Attorney General's office are being tried by the Department of Labor, and in 99 cases almost out of 100, maybe that is putting it too strong, they are being dismissed, and you gentlemen on that side are just as loud in your denunciation of Mr. Post in this regard as anybody on this side. My position is this—that it is a useless waste of money to appropriate money by millions for the Department of Justice to make arrests if nothing is to come of the arrest except to release the person arrested.

Gentlemen say that some of that was appropriated for the arrest of profiteers. I want the profiteer sent to jail, and so we reported every penny that the Attorney General asked for in the deficiency bill. Since then we have seen the commodities and necessities of life mount in price, with all the laws necessary to prevent profiteering on the statute books, all the laws that existed at the time he made the estimate—we have seen sugar go from 10 cents a pound up to 30 cents a pound, and, so far as I know, nobody has gone to jail. I do not know whether they have been arrested or not.

What are the facts? In 1915 all that the Attorney General had for this purpose was \$485,000 and a deficiency of \$25,000. In 1916 he had \$600,000. We appropriate by this bill, notwithstanding the fact that the Treasury is depleted, \$2,000,000, which is more than has ever been appropriated before during all the time since the foundation of the Government in a single year, except for this year.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman said that 99 out of every 100 arrests that were made were dismissed. This record shows that 500 have been taken up.

Mr. GOOD. I said of the last arrests. The gentleman knows that a large number of those were arrested in the first instance, and the Department of Labor did issue the warrants of deportation and, as the gentleman says, about 500 were deported. But I am talking about the arrests that were made on January 1 or thereabouts, and now practically all of the leaders are being released as fast as they come before the Department of Labor.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is not the fault of the Attorney General.

Mr. GOOD. No; it is not. I have not intended to give that impression. But why appropriate \$500,000 to make arrests of alien anarchists if they are to be released at once. Rather expensive and entirely useless.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is not blaming the Attorney General because we have an anarchist in the Department of Labor, who is protecting his brother anarchists. We are responsible for Post's remaining there. We ought to put him out. You are in the majority and you can put him out.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. May we have the amendment reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee) there were 40 ayes and 47 noes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. GOOD and Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported 43 ayes and 57 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For salaries, fees, and expenses of United States marshals and their deputies, including the office expenses of United States marshals in the District of Alaska, services rendered in behalf of the United States or otherwise, services in Alaska and Oklahoma in collecting evidence for the United States when so specially directed by the Attorney General, and maintenance, alteration, repair, and operation of horse-drawn and motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles used in connection with the transaction of the official business of the office of United States marshal for the District of Columbia, \$2,061,000. Advances to United States marshals, in accordance with existing law, may be made from the proper appropriations, as herein provided, immediately upon the passage of this act; but no disbursements shall be made prior to July 1, 1920, by said disbursing officers from the funds thus advanced, and no disbursements shall be made therefrom to liquidate expenses for the fiscal year 1920, or prior years: *Provided*, That there shall be paid hereunder any necessary cost of keeping vessels or other property attached or libeled in admiralty in such amounts as the court, on petition setting forth the facts under oath, may allow: *Provided further*, That marshals and office deputy marshals (except in the District of Alaska) may be granted a per diem of not to exceed \$4 and \$3, respectively, in lieu of subsistence, instead of, but under the conditions prescribed for, the present allowance for actual expenses of subsistence.

Mr. GANDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. In line 21 I move to strike out the words "and \$3, respectively."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 123, line 21, strike out the words "and \$3, respectively."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order. It would not help if he struck out the provision, because the law fixes that and they would not be allowed to pay in excess of the statutory provision. To strike out the words here would avail nothing.

Mr. GANDY. I want to say that my object in offering the amendment is to call attention primarily to the various rates of per diem that are allowed in this and other bills. I think it wrong in practice, not conducive to good business or good administration of affairs to say that one official shall have an allowance for expenses in the field of \$3, that another shall have \$4, another \$5, another \$6, and we have some in this bill up to \$7.

Mr. BLANTON. That has been stricken out.

Mr. GANDY. I am informed that that is stricken out.

Mr. GOOD. The committee was aware of that fact; but the per diem in no instance is sufficient to pay the expenses of these officials, owing to the increase in hotel bills. But the committee did not have jurisdiction of this matter, and it is doubtful if we could have taken the time to have considered the question in all its aspects and reported out a bill that would have been equitable. So we simply made the appropriation in accordance with existing law.

Mr. GANDY. If the appropriation committee has not jurisdiction, I hope that some committee will bring in a bill that will not require an officer of the Government when he is on his official work to go down into his salary for a part of the expenses of the trip.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For salaries of United States district attorneys and expenses of United States district attorneys and their regular assistants, including the office expenses of United States district attorneys in Alaska, and for salaries of regularly appointed clerks to United States district attorneys for services rendered during vacancy in the office of the United States district attorney, \$730,000: *Provided*, That United States district attorneys and their regular assistants may be granted a per diem of not to exceed \$4 in lieu of subsistence, instead of, but under the conditions prescribed for, the present allowance for actual expenses of subsistence.

Mr. PARRISH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question. In some portions of the country, due to extraordinary conditions, it is practically impossible for the United States district attorney to live on the salary that he is paid. I have been told that there is some legislation in view which will permit the Attorney General to increase the salary. Can the gentleman inform me in respect to that?

Mr. GOOD. Does the gentleman refer to the salary of the assistants?

Mr. PARRISH. No; of the district attorneys. The salary is fixed by law now.

Mr. GOOD. As the gentleman knows, the salary of the district attorney is fixed by law. I think there is a bill pending before the Committee on the Judiciary with regard to the matter, but I am not advised as to what action has been taken on the bill.

Mr. PARRISH. In so far as the assistants are concerned, will the Attorney General have any power to pay to the first assistant district attorney more than he gets now? I understand he now gets \$2,500.

Mr. GOOD. Under the provisions of this paragraph, the Attorney General can pay up to \$3,000. He can not pay to exceed that. He can fix the salary at any amount up to \$3,000.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. The gentleman from Iowa makes the statement that the Attorney General can fix the salary of the assistant district attorney as he pleases up to \$3,000. Of course, that is the language of the law, but there are a great many ways of enforcing and a great many ways of evading laws. A large share of the people in the district attorneys' offices throughout the country are there as special assistants, doing exactly the same work as the regular assistant does.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The regular assistant has a salary limited to \$3,000, but the special assistants have no limitation on their salaries, and they receive a much higher compensation, many of them, than \$3,000 a year. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, in answering the question I had in mind only the regular assistants who are provided for in the appropriation of \$500,000, but in the very next paragraph, carrying \$450,000, there is one assistant provided for who is employed at \$9,000, one at \$8,500, one at \$7,500, and several at salaries of \$5,000 or over.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Oh, yes; and those salaries were intended in the first place to be paid to attorneys doing special work, but the Attorney General's office—and I am not criticizing it in this respect—not only is very bright in knowing how to enforce the law, but it is exceedingly bright in knowing how to evade the law. Having a law providing that the regular assistants shall not be paid more than \$3,000, they appoint a regular assistant and call him a special assistant. That is simply an evasion of the law. Perhaps the limitation ought not to be in the law. I do not know.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Do I understand the gentleman to say that they have any attorneys called special assistants who are permanently located?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Permanently located in nearly all of the district attorneys' offices.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That may be in some of the larger offices, like Chicago or New York, but I do not think that applies all over the country.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That would apply to an office where they have a large amount of work.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They have a great deal of work in all of these offices.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do not say that they do not need them; I am not complaining about that.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. This appropriation is specially limited to assistants to the Attorney General employed in special cases. I do not see how, under that appropriation, if we are talking about the same appropriation, what the gentleman says is possible.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I am not referring to any special appropriation, but I am telling a fact.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. SANFORD having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed a joint resolution and bills of the following titles:

On May 3, 1920:

H. R. 13387. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the St. Louis River between the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin.

On May 5, 1920:

H. J. Res. 301. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of War to grant revocable licenses for the removal of sand and gravel from the Fort Douglas Military Reservation for industrial purposes.

On May 6, 1920:

H. R. 9228. An act to authorize the establishment of a Coast Guard station on the coast of Lake Superior, in Cook County, Minn.; and

H. R. 9629. An act for the relief of the Merritt & Chapman Derrick & Wrecking Co.

On May 7, 1920:

H. R. 12956. An act extending the time for constructing a bridge across the Bayou Bartholomew, in the State of Arkansas; and

H. R. 13253. An act to grant the consent of Congress to the Elmer Red River Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across the Red River.

On May 8, 1920:

H. R. 13677. An act making appropriations to supply a deficiency in appropriations for the Federal control of transportation systems and to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 12869. An act for the construction of a bridge across the Pentwater River or Pentwater Lake, Mich.

#### SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

For salaries: Warden, \$4,000; deputy warden, \$2,000; chaplains—1 \$1,500, 1 \$1,200; physician, \$1,800; pharmacist and physician's assistant, \$1,000; chief clerk, \$1,800; record clerk, \$1,200; stenographer, \$900; clerks—1 \$1,200, 1 \$1,000, 4 at \$900 each; head cook, \$1,000; steward and storekeeper, \$1,200; superintendent of farm and transportation, \$1,200; 3 captains of watch, at \$1,500 each; guards, \$124,800; 2 teamsters, at \$600 each; engineer and electrician, \$1,500; 2 assistants, at \$1,200 each; in all, \$159,000.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In a recent deficiency appropriation bill the Committee on Appropriations provided for increasing the pay of guards at Federal penitentiaries by inserting a provision that for the first year of service they should receive \$70 a month, which is the pay they have been receiving a number of years, that for the second year of service they should receive \$80, for the third year \$90, and for the fourth and subsequent years \$100 a month. This became a law on a deficiency bill a couple of months ago, and was entirely just and proper on the part of the committee. However, at these same institutions there is another class of employees—the clerks. There are six clerks, I think, at Leavenworth Penitentiary and about the same number at Atlanta. These clerks are employees who are receiving much less money than was provided for the guards in a recent amendment, although these clerks take a civil-service examination which is of a higher class than the guards. I think they should be paid as high at least as the guard is paid. I understand that the Department of Justice has strongly recommended to the committee that the same provisions, or even stronger provisions, be made with respect to the clerks that have been made for the guards. I think the committee should make a reasonable increase in the pay of these clerks.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. How much do the guards receive, as well as the clerks?

Mr. ANTHONY. The guards are now receiving, practically all of them, \$100 a month, though of course there are some new ones who do not receive that.

Mr. BLANTON. Ought they to receive more than the school-teachers of the District of Columbia?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think the school-teachers should receive more money.

Mr. BLANTON. But we just turned them down this morning.

Mr. ANTHONY. And I want to call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to the fact that the Department of Justice has asked that this provision be made for the clerks. It was my understanding that some provision would be made for them on a deficiency bill. This seems to be the last opportunity you will have to take care of them. Under the law I think they are authorized at \$900 a year. One of them, I think, is getting \$1,200 a year, one of them \$1,000, and four \$900 a year.

Mr. GOOD. They get the bonus.

Mr. ANTHONY. They get the bonus.

Mr. GOOD. One clerk gets \$1,440 and the other \$1,240 and the other four \$1,140 each.

Mr. ANTHONY. I submit that the base of \$3 for a stenographer and clerk is not the amount of pay that is commensurate with the work done by these men and is entirely out of line with the rate of payment that is accorded practically to every occupation in the immediate neighborhood of these institutions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. They get the bonus; have they been in the service over a year—

Mr. ANTHONY. I understand the chairman of the committee says they are receiving a bonus, but that is a temporary matter.

Mr. GOOD. They receive it for next year on the legislative bill; that has already been appropriated.

Mr. ANTHONY. That is for one year, and we do not know—

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will yield.



Mr. CALDWELL. If these men are Republicans, I will vote for it. Are they Republicans or Democrats?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think these gentlemen are perhaps divided—

Mr. CALDWELL. Was the gentleman in here the other day when we had up the matter of the cemeterial appropriation, where a member of the Republican steering committee opposed it on the ground that they were Democrats?

Mr. ANTHONY. No; I did not hear anything of the kind.

Mr. CALDWELL. The gentleman did not vote on that proposition?

Mr. ANTHONY. I was not here.

Mr. CALDWELL. I will tell the gentleman, notwithstanding the statement of the gentleman, a member of the steering committee, that 40 out of 41 were registered Republicans.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANTHONY: Page 129, line 25, after the last semicolon, insert:

"Provided, That from and including July 1, 1920, the salaries of clerks and stenographers shall be as follows:

"For the first year of service, \$75 per month.

"For the second year of service, \$80 per month.

"For the third year of service, \$90 per month.

"For the fourth and subsequent years of service, \$100 per month."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will have to make the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will not make the point of order against it; it is exactly the same provision he himself included in the deficiency bill for this other class of employees.

Mr. GOOD. We put the other item in for the other class of employees to meet a condition that was very serious. Here were guards whom we understood were scarcely men of families, at least that is the character of men that they wanted at a penitentiary for guards. We wanted guards who were good, strong, law-abiding citizens. Now, because they were only paying \$70 a month they could not get that kind of men and were obliged to go out on the street corners and get men to put in there in charge of the penitentiary whom they know nothing about at all, and the situation was so serious the department came and asked for this legislation, and the subcommittee on the deficiency was impressed with the serious condition that confronted these institutions, and we granted that amount. Now, it is true that bill was passed providing for a new scale for guards after the estimates for the sundry civil bill for next year were made up, therefore there was no estimate for guards or for clerks. Since that time the department has made an estimate, just as the gentleman has stated, as I recall, increasing the pay somewhat, I have forgotten what it is, but I will say to the gentleman that when the officials came before the committee they never referred to it. The item not being carried on the work sheet before me, I knew nothing about it and did not know then that they had asked for it, and they never suggested these clerks were of the same character at all.

Mr. ANTHONY. The gentleman, of course, remembers there were hearings before the committee, and will remember at one of the hearings I appeared, and from the hearing it is evident that the gentleman from Georgia also appeared—

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. And made some presentation to the committee.

Mr. GOOD. That was a month after we had heard the Department of Justice.

Mr. ANTHONY. And I find upon inquiry of the Department of Justice to-day they say that they have for some months recommended that to take care of these people.

Mr. GOOD. They forwarded an estimate for that purpose. It is true the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] appeared for these clerks. The gentleman spoke very forcefully for these clerks and the committee was impressed with the situation; but, after all, the same serious situation does not confront us concerning these clerks that confronted the penitentiary in regard to guards.

Mr. ANTHONY. If the gentleman will yield right there. The only reason he was not confronted with the same situation is because these clerks are nearly all old employees of the Government. They are men who have been with the Government some 10, 12, and 16 years, and most of them were former guards and for the reason they are fixed in their places, and otherwise they probably would leave the Government service and—

Mr. GOOD. The lower paid clerks will get \$1,140.

Mr. ANTHONY. With the bonus?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; that is their pay.

Mr. ANTHONY. Is Congress going to continue that?

Mr. GOOD. It is for the next year; it has already been voted upon. I hope the gentleman will not press this. I knew nothing about it except the gentleman's statement, and I do not believe the gentleman believes these clerks are on the same level with the work of the guards. Besides, we must remember that we are not granting other increases to clerks of this class anywhere.

Mr. ANTHONY. Certainly, just exactly; and these clerks were formerly—

Mr. CALDWELL. I do not like to interrupt the gentleman over there, but I must ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ANTHONY. It seems to me the amendment offered is along the line of simply increasing the pay of the clerks and is in order.

Mr. BLANTON. It changes existing law, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment seeks to establish the salaries of clerks and stenographers at the Leavenworth Penitentiary permanently, and therefore sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For clothing, transportation, and traveling expenses, including the same objects specified under this head for the penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kans., \$90,000.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question. I want to ask him if the committee went thoroughly into these general appropriations for the support of these penitentiaries with the idea of determining whether the appropriations for subsistence and maintenance were sufficient or not, or has the committee arbitrarily cut the appropriations down to a figure they deem proper?

Mr. GOOD. The committee has made some cuts. For instance, for the subsistence at Atlanta we cut only \$10,000. The department asked for \$175,000 and we gave them \$165,000, and they are getting along this year with \$150,000. We went into the matter somewhat. It is costing a little more—

Mr. ANTHONY. The reason I ask the question is that for the last two years large deficiencies have been brought in under these heads, and I understand under the appropriations which were made last year that many of the firms who furnished supplies under the contracts which were let in accordance with these appropriations have had to wait nine months for their pay from the Government after the delivery of goods and supplies, and some of them have not been paid yet, because of the large deficiencies which were created, and which the Congress has failed to appropriate for and take care of. And it struck me that was not a proper businesslike basis for conducting the affairs of these big institutions.

Mr. GOOD. Of course it was not. We are confronted with this situation, namely, that at Leavenworth they are building a new wing for the penitentiary and will have it ready for occupancy before the end of the year. They have enlarged the penitentiary at Atlanta, and at McNeils Island they have also enlarged the building. We carry in the provision \$870,000 for support of prisoners that are mostly confined in State and county jails, and if that policy is reversed and the penitentiaries are filled to their limit, necessarily there will have to be larger appropriations for their subsistence. If, on the other hand, they do not add materially to the number, I think the appropriation will be sufficient.

Mr. ANTHONY. The point I make is this: If business firms who contract to furnish supplies to these institutions have to wait for nine months or a year, it is going to cost more money.

Mr. GOOD. We have had deficiency bills every four or five months in the last five years, and there never has been a time when one of these deficiency bills failed to provide the money to take care of any legitimate claim against the Government.

Mr. ANTHONY. Is it possible, then, that the Department of Justice is hiding the real expenditure for these institutions in asking for the correct appropriations?

Mr. GOOD. I do not know.

Mr. ANTHONY. I know that these deficiencies exist, because officials have told me they do.

Mr. GOOD. At Atlanta, as I recall now, they might need a little more by the end of the year. They had \$150,000, and certainly everybody up to date who has furnished anything for that penitentiary has had his money or the money is available. I think the same thing is true at Leavenworth. They have plenty of money.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, National Training School for Boys, \$67,536.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from Iowa how many boys are in this institution at this time? Does he know?

Mr. GOOD. It is my recollection that there are 406 boys there.

Mr. BEE. Is ample provision being made for taking care of industry for them, so that when they come out of the institution they are worth while?

Mr. GOOD. They are given a course in manual training.

Mr. BEE. The reason I asked was that a young man from my city was sent to this institution, and when he came back I was surprised—the Federal judge having stated that he would come out with a trade—that he did not have the training that enabled him to go into anything definite at that time.

Mr. GOOD. They teach brick making and carpentry, and especially farming. The institution is located about 3 or 4 miles out of Washington. They have 230 or 240 acres of land, and to the extent that the institution is equipped to give manual training, they do give it to the boys there.

Mr. BEE. I consider it one of the best institutions in the country, and I hoped they were making ample provision.

Mr. GOOD. It is a very good institution.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.  
LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE.

General expenses: For supplies, repairs, maintenance, and incidental expenses of lighthouses and other lights, beacons, buoyage, fog signals, lighting of rivers heretofore authorized to be lighted, light vessels, other aids to navigation, and lighthouse tenders, including the establishment, repair, and improvement of beacons and day marks and purchase of land for same; establishment of post lights, buoys, submarine signals, and fog signals; establishment of oil or carbide houses, not to exceed \$10,000: *Provided*, That any oil or carbide house erected hereunder shall not exceed \$550 in cost; construction of necessary out-buildings at a cost not exceeding \$500 at any one light station in any fiscal year; improvement of grounds and buildings connected with light stations and depots; restoring light stations and depots and buildings connected therewith: *Provided*, That such restoration shall be limited to the original purpose of the structures; wages of persons attending post lights; temporary employees, and field force while engaged on works of general repair and maintenance, and laborers and mechanics at lighthouse depots; rations and provisions or commutation thereof for keepers of lighthouses, working parties in the field, officers and crews of light vessels and tenders, and officials and other authorized persons of the Lighthouse Service on duty on board of such tenders or vessels, and money accruing from commutation for rations and provisions for the above-named persons on board of tenders and light vessels or in working parties in the field may be paid on proper vouchers to the person having charge of the mess of such vessel or party; reimbursement under rules prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce of keepers of light stations and masters of light vessels and of lighthouse tenders for rations and provisions and clothing furnished shipwrecked persons who may be temporarily provided for by them, not exceeding in all \$5,000 in any fiscal year; fuel and rent of quarters where necessary for keepers of lighthouses; purchase of land sites for fog signals; rent of necessary ground for all such lights and beacons as are for temporary use or to mark changeable channels and which in consequence can not be made permanent; rent of offices, depots, and wharves; traveling expenses; mileage; library books for light stations and vessels, and technical books and periodicals not exceeding \$1,000; traveling and subsistence expenses of teachers while actually employed by States or private persons to instruct the children of keepers of lighthouses; all other contingent expenses of district offices and depots; and not exceeding \$8,500 for contingent expenses of the office of the Bureau of Lighthouses in the District of Columbia, \$4,200,000.

Hereafter post-lantern lights and other aids to navigation may be established and maintained, in the discretion of the Commissioner of Lighthouses, on the Yukon River and its tributaries, Alaska. The cost thereof shall be paid out of the annual appropriations for the Lighthouse Service.

Keepers of lighthouses: For salaries of not exceeding 1,800 lighthouse and fog-signal keepers and persons attending lights exclusive of post lights, \$1,300,000.

Lighthouse vessels: For salaries and wages of officers and crews of light vessels and lighthouse tenders, including temporary employment when necessary, \$1,800,000.

Superintendents, clerks, etc.: For salaries of 17 superintendents of lighthouses, and of clerks and other authorized permanent employees in the district offices and depots of the Lighthouse Service, exclusive of those regularly employed in the office of the Bureau of Lighthouses, District of Columbia, \$400,000.

For retired pay of officers and employees engaged in the field service or on vessels of the Lighthouse Service, except persons continuously employed in district offices and shops, \$70,000.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I notice in this section of the bill that the appropriation is a lump-sum appropriation for a number of purposes in connection with the Lighthouse Bureau of the Department of Commerce, and I notice among those items one for fog signals. I want to ask the chairman of the committee if in the appropriation which is allowed for this bureau there is a sufficient amount to take care of the emergency needs or recommendations with respect to those signals, which are now particularly important when we are developing such an enormous merchant marine, and when it is highly essential that in the ports of this country adequate safeguards should be given to shipping to protect it in times of fog as well as on other occasions?

Mr. GOOD. I think so.

Mr. BRIGGS. I have in mind the recommendation of the Department of Commerce for the establishment of a fog signal at the port of Galveston. Through that harbor passes the commerce which not only goes through the port of Galveston but Texas City, Port Bolivar, and Houston as well.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Do they not have a fog signal there?

Mr. BRIGGS. They do not; and they have made recommendations for a fog signal at \$6,500.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. This will not provide fog signals.

Mr. GOOD. They can purchase one.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Oh, no; they can not. Fog signals are provided for by special legislation. All this is is an appropriation for aids to navigation. I think there is a bill coming up shortly—I do not think it ought to come up—providing for additional aids to navigation.

I served for many years on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and as chairman of a subcommittee dealing with new aids to navigation. If there is any really important place in the United States that has not got some aid to navigation, or any important place that has not got a light or fog signal, I do not know where it is.

Mr. BRIGGS. They have lights, and this is probably the greatest cotton port in the world. They ship more cotton from there than from any other port in the world.

Mr. GOOD. I think they have authority to place a fog signal there.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. No; I do not think so. We pass special bills in reference to this matter—general acts, of course—providing for new aids to navigation in various places, and providing what they shall be; but in nearly every place where they have a light and can use a fog signal they have a fog signal in connection with it.

Mr. BRIGGS. They have some provision whereby they erected a light on the end of this south jetty, for instance, which projects out into the ocean about six and a half miles from the port of Galveston. It is one of the revetments there that assists in making the harbor and deepening the channel.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The Lighthouse Board recommends in its annual report every year the establishment of new aids to navigation. Those recommendations go to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] is a leading light. They have reported a bill taking in, I suppose, the cases that are most needed. I do not remember what they are. I think that bill is still pending. It is likely to be called up when that committee is reached on a Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. BRIGGS. Does that bill carry an appropriation as well as just an authorization?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Just the authorization.

Mr. BRIGGS. I understood the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to state that, in any event, this appropriation carries sufficient money to meet the needs of that department with respect to these aids to navigation. Is that correct, I will ask the chairman?

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that an estimate was made by the department, and my answer is based upon that. When the department estimated that it needed \$6,500 for improving Galveston Jetty Light Station, I assumed, of course, that there was a light station there and that that light station has been established by law. If not, how could they improve one not established and built?

Mr. BRIGGS. They have a light station there.

Mr. GOOD. And when they asked for \$6,500, without saying just what it was for, of course I assumed that they would spend it for the purposes for which they were making the estimate.

Mr. BRIGGS. There is a light station there.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; and there being a light station there, I will say to the gentleman that they could buy a fog signal out of this appropriation just as quickly as they could out of an appropriation of \$6,500 that did not describe a fog signal.

Mr. BRIGGS. So that this does carry that item in this bill?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do not know what they will do. When these aids are established they are established as light stations, or light and fog-signal stations, specifically naming what they are to be; and if the department spends money in a way not authorized, it is violating the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Of course, I do not know that the department will do this work. What we have done is to give \$4,200,000 as against the regular appropriation of \$3,500,000 last year, and



then \$500,000 to take care of considerable damage that was done to the Lighthouse Service during the year. Now, we have carried \$200,000 more than the total appropriation for this year, an amount ample to take care of the very needy projects; and if this is one of the very needy projects in the opinion of the Lighthouse Service, and if it is authorized, then the service will have the money to do the work.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

Mr. BRAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRAND: Page 135, line 7, after the word "Columbia," strike out "\$4,200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,300,000."

Mr. BRAND. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this amendment is introduced by me at the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DRANE], who is interested in this paragraph of the bill. I am informed at his office that this proposed increase of \$100,000, making the appropriation \$4,300,000, is in accordance with the estimate furnished by the department to the committee, which reduced the estimate from \$4,300,000 to \$4,200,000.

The gentleman from Florida is interested in this increase, as is the whole State of Florida, on account of the imperfections of its water front. He is absent unavoidably, and at his request I have introduced this amendment and submit it to the committee with the hope that it will be given proper consideration and passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BRAND].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. BRAND. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia demands a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 13, yeas 19.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to transfer, under such rules and regulations as he may deem advisable, to educational institutions and to museums such instrument of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey as, in his judgment, are of historical value, but of no further use in the work of that survey, except such historical instruments as may be needed by the Smithsonian Institution for exhibit at the National Museum.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, on page 142, line 21, I move to strike out the word "instrument" and insert the word "instruments."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Yes Bay (Alaska) Hatchery: Superintendent, \$1,500; foreman, \$1,200; two fish-culturists, at \$900 each; three apprentice fish-culturists, at \$900 each; cook, \$900; in all, \$8,220.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MILLER. I do so, Mr. Chairman, in order to ask a question in regard to Yes Bay hatchery. I believe there were some items eliminated from that Yes Bay estimate for the scientific propagation of fish.

Mr. GOOD. They have for the current year \$8,220. We gave them just exactly what they have this year.

Mr. MILLER. Was not their appropriation asked for some special purpose?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; they asked that the salary of the superintendent be increased from \$1,500 to \$2,000, that of the foreman from \$1,200 to \$1,500, and the salaries of the two fish culturists from \$900 to \$1,200 each. The committee did just what it did in all the other cases, left those salaries just as they are at present. They asked the same increases in all the other stations practically, and the committee denied the increases.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Propagation of food fishes: For maintenance, equipment, and operations of fish-cultural stations, general propagation of food fishes and their distribution, including movement, maintenance, and repairs of cars, purchase of equipment and apparatus, contingent expenses, temporary labor, and not to exceed \$10,000 for propagation and distribution of fresh-water mussels and the necessary expenses connected therewith, \$400,000.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman of the committee a question. Is there any provision, and if so where, for the maintenance of what they call rescue stations? I know they have them on the Mississippi River. The river overflows and a great many fish come out of the river and get into the low places, and then the water recedes and they are left there, and in the course of a month or so the water dries up and the fish are destroyed. The department have what they call rescue stations, and they get tens of thousands, and I suppose, millions of fish out of the borrow pits and other holes where the water remains for a while. That is a very important activity. I could not locate the appropriation for it in this bill.

Mr. GOOD. I suppose that is paid for out of the appropriation carried on page 151, commencing with line 18, if the work is not done at some of the permanent stations. At Homer, Minn., there is one of these rescue stations, and I am familiar with the work that is being done, as most of the Members are, because streams are being supplied with fish now from these rescue stations. I think some of that rescue work is done by launches and other vessels that are maintained by the bureau.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I know they have these rescue stations in my district, and they do a great deal of good. They save many thousands of fish. I was wondering if those rescue stations were being taken care of. They ought to be.

Mr. GOOD. Yes. They have the same money for next year as they have for this year. We have not eliminated any appropriation.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. The gentleman feels confident that they are being provided for in some of these appropriations?

Mr. GOOD. Yes. If the work is not done at stations for which specific appropriations are made, it is paid for out of one of the lump sums provided for in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Inquiry respecting food fishes: For inquiry into the causes of the decrease of food fishes in the waters of the United States, the study of the methods and relations of the fisheries, and for investigation and experiments in respect to the aquatic animals, plants, and waters, in the interests of fish culture and the fishery industries, including expenses of travel and preparation of reports, \$45,000.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, on page 152, line 7, I move to strike out the words "the study of the methods and relations of the fisheries."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOOD: Page 152, line 7, after the word "States," strike out "the study of the methods and relations of the fisheries."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am doing this at the request of the bureau. The committee in framing the bill felt that this sentence should appear in this paragraph instead of the paragraph that follows. The paragraph that follows is a paragraph dealing with statistical inquiries only, to provide for statistics with regard to fisheries, and it seemed to us that the scientific work ought to be performed in the division appropriated for in this paragraph, and the statistical division confined to pure statistics; but for some reason or other for a number of years this statistical bureau has had saddled upon it some scientific work, and the department claims that it will be seriously hampered if we change the mode. So if this amendment is agreed to I propose to offer an amendment to insert in the next paragraph the language stricken out of this paragraph. We can try it another year, but sooner or later some one will make an adjustment in the interest of economy along this line.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Statistical inquiry: For collections and compilation of statistics of the fisheries, including travel and preparation of reports, and all other necessary expenses in connection therewith, \$5,500.

Mr. GOOD. Now, Mr. Chairman, I move to insert, after the word "fisheries," the words "the study of the methods and relations of the fisheries," and I also move to strike out the figures "\$5,500," in line 15, and insert the figures "\$7,500."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOOD: Page 152, line 13, after the word "fisheries," insert the words "the study of the methods and relations of the fisheries," and in line 15 strike out "\$5,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$7,500."

Mr. LAYTON. Is the gentleman increasing the appropriation?

Mr. GOOD. Two thousand dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman if there is any provision in the bill for the repair of fish hatcheries?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; on page 151, beginning with line 4, is an appropriation for maintenance and equipment.

Mr. MILLER. That would include repairs of fish hatcheries?

Mr. GOOD. The ordinary repairs as far as maintenance is concerned.

Mr. MILLER. I wish to ask the gentleman another question. Referring back to page 150, line 1, in reference to Yes Bay, was not there an appropriation asked for by the Department of Commerce of \$15,000 and one for \$60,000?

Mr. GOOD. I have a letter from the head of the bureau, but it does not ask for any special appropriation for repairs of that station, but states that they could make the needed repairs out of the regular appropriation.

Mr. MILLER. What is the regular appropriation?

Mr. GOOD. Four hundred thousand dollars; that is used in all the fisheries. Of course, if we carried an independent item for each station, this lump sum of \$400,000 would be unnecessary.

Mr. MILLER. My casual reading of the item would not carry with it the right to make repairs.

Mr. GOOD. The commissioner wrote me, under date of April 9, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,  
BUREAU OF FISHERIES,  
Washington, April 9, 1920.

HON. JAMES W. GOOD,  
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The governor of Alaska has sent to this office your letter to him, dated April 7, regarding an appropriation for repairs at the salmon hatchery at Yes Bay, Alaska.

Permit me to state that no special estimate for this purpose is before your committee. The hatchery is important, and the repairs are urgently needed, but we expect to be able to make them out of our general appropriation.

Respectfully, yours,

H. M. SMITH, Commissioner.

Mr. MILLER. I have a number of telegrams from the Association of Pacific Fisheries regarding Yes Bay, in which they urgently ask that the appropriation be continued.

Mr. GOOD. It is continued.

The Clerk read as follows:

Alaska, general service: For protecting the seal fisheries of Alaska, including the furnishing of food, fuel, clothing, and other necessities of life to the natives of the Pribilof Islands of Alaska, transportation of supplies to and from the islands, expenses of travel of agents and other employees and subsistence while on said islands, hire and maintenance of vessels, and for all expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the act approved April 21, 1910, entitled "An act to protect the seal fisheries of Alaska, and for other purposes," and for the protection of the fisheries of Alaska, including travel, hire of boats, employment of temporary labor, and all other necessary expenses therewith, \$140,000.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to insert after the word "expenses," page 153, line 9, the word "connected."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 153, line 9, after the word "expenses," insert "connected."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman how many natives on the Pribilof Islands the Government supplies with food and clothing?

Mr. GOOD. Not very many. Since the flu epidemic a number of native children were left orphans in Alaska. It is necessary to provide food and clothing for them. There are not very many. My collection is about 200.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, with permission of the gentleman I will say that most of that expenditure is repaid. In the main these are sums paid for supplies furnished the natives who have to do with the killing and skinning of the seals and the care of the whole herd.

Mr. GOOD. That is correct. I was thinking of another item regarding care of the natives.

Mr. WATSON. Has the chairman an estimate of the value of the furs?

Mr. GOOD. The receipts on account of furs during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, amounted to \$1,282,000.

Mr. WATSON. That is for all Alaska?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. And \$150,000 protects over a million dollars, which is the value of the annual sale of seal furs?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; much more than that. That is about the annual crop. Of course, the seal herd belongs to the United States.

Mr. WATSON. But I wanted to know the value of the furs protected by this appropriation.

Mr. GOOD. The skins that year amounted to \$1,182,000, and we are only killing a limited amount.

Mr. WATSON. Is there a closed season?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; they are allowed to kill only a certain number of seals. The law specifically fixes that.

Mr. WATSON. Are the natives employed by the Government?

Mr. GOOD. They are.

Mr. WATSON. And, of course, paid by the Government?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Testing of large scales: For investigation and testing of railroad track scales, elevator scales, and other scales used in weighing commodities for interstate shipments and to secure equipment and assistance for testing the scales used by the Government in its transactions with the public, such as post-office, navy-yard, and customhouse scales, and for the purpose of cooperating with the States in securing uniformity in the weights and measures laws and in the methods of inspection, including personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, \$40,000.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### IMMIGRATION SERVICE.

For enforcement of the laws regulating immigration of aliens into the United States, including the contract-labor laws; cost of reports of decisions of the Federal courts, and digests thereof, for the use of the Commissioner General of Immigration; salaries and expenses of all officers, clerks, and employees appointed to enforce said laws, including per diem in lieu of subsistence when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914; enforcement of the provisions of the act of February 5, 1917, entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States," and acts amendatory thereof; necessary supplies, including exchange of typewriting machines, alterations, and repairs, and for all other expenses authorized by said act; preventing the unlawful entry of Chinese into the United States, by the appointment of suitable officers to enforce the laws in relation thereto; expenses of returning to China all Chinese persons found to be unlawfully in the United States, including the cost of imprisonment and actual expenses of conveyance of Chinese persons to the frontier or seaboard for deportation; refunding of head tax and maintenance bills upon presentation of evidence showing conclusively that collection was made through error of Government officers; all to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, \$2,600,000: *Provided*, That the purchase, use, maintenance, and operation of horse and motor vehicles required in the enforcement of the immigration and Chinese exclusion laws outside of the District of Columbia may be contracted for and the cost thereof paid from the appropriation for the enforcement of those laws, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Labor may prescribe: *Provided further*, That not more than \$12,000 of the sum appropriated herein may be expended in the purchase and maintenance of such motor vehicles: *Provided further*, That the appropriation herein made for the enforcement of the immigration laws shall be available for carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to exclude and expel from the United States aliens who are members of the anarchistic and similar classes," approved October 16, 1918, and acts amendatory thereof.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUDSPETH: Page 157, line 8, after the figures "\$2,600,000," insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That the Secretary of Labor in the expenditure of said sum shall allot to the Commissioner General of Immigration for maintaining a border patrol guard, to guard the border between the United States and Mexico, against the unlawful entry of aliens and undesirable persons into the United States, such amounts as will enable the Commissioner General of Immigration to perform adequately the duties authorized by law as to the exclusion of such aliens and undesirable persons."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, I want to state to the chairman of the committee that I am not endeavoring to add to the appropriation, but merely ask that an adequate sum out of \$2,600,000 be allotted to the Director General of Immigration for the purpose of enforcing the law now in existence. I will state to the Members of the House that a hearing was had and my resolution was reported, and I want to read a part of the testimony of the supervising inspector, Mr. Berkshire, who was on the witness stand for two days, I believe, before the Committee on Immigration. This gentleman is now stationed and has been for 14 years in my home city of El Paso as supervising inspector, and he testified as to the need for reenforcing the border patrol, which was established by law two years ago. President Wilson, out of the fund voted to him by this Congress of \$100,000,000 for the enforcement of law, granted \$500,000 for this border patrol. Mr. Berkshire testified as follows:

Mr. BAKER. Well, with the ease with which they can cross and with no guards to prevent them, it has been known that there has been a very fair sum paid for the landing of each Japanese or Chinese that crosses; has that not been a fact within the last few years?

Mr. BERKSHIRE. Yes; that is one of the big problems of the border.



Mr. RAKER. Then, as a matter of fact, the Government of the United States, for the want of an appropriation, has practically left down, and now leaves down, the bars between the United States and Mexico to permit undesirables—Mexicans, Chinese, and Japanese—to enter the United States.

Mr. BERKSHIRE. That is the situation, in a few words.

Mr. RAKER. Diseased or otherwise; containing infectious diseases as well as being otherwise undesirable.

Mr. BERKSHIRE. There is practically nothing to prevent them from coming in if they so desire.

Mr. SIEGEL. At the place where you are stationed, how many physicians have you for the purpose of examining immigrants?

Mr. BERKSHIRE. Well, we have one or more physicians at every station; we have a sufficient number of physicians to examine—

Mr. SIEGEL (interposing). How many to examine each immigrant?

Mr. BERKSHIRE. Only one.

Mr. SIEGEL. And that is done under special order?

Mr. BERKSHIRE. The Public Health Service supplies the medical officer for any station we may have; it depends on how many we require.

That is a part of the testimony of this gentleman who was the supervising inspector on the border for a distance of 2,000 miles. Since this border patrol was taken off, his testimony goes on to state, hundreds and thousands of Japanese, undesirable Mexicans, and Chinese have crossed the border at will. I was interested in a discussion which took place a few moments ago relative to raising the appropriation for the Attorney General's Department. I want to state that unless the border patrol is put back to its original strength, you will have to still further increase the appropriation for the Attorney General's Department to enforce the law and keep out these undesirable Chinese, Japanese, and Mexicans who are coming across in that rough country, where, as Mr. Berkshire states, they have only a sufficient amount of men at the regular immigration stations. It is just a question of whether or not the Members of this House want the law enforced against undesirable aliens. I would say to you that if the conditions described by Mr. Berkshire and other immigration officials continues on that border we will be overrun in two years with undesirable aliens—Japanese, Chinese, and Mexicans.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If the Secretary of Labor at will can lift the provisions in regard to the literacy test and the head tax and let Mexicans come in, why have a border patrol?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Simply to keep out the undesirables.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. And also, if as the testimony shows, when they had this border patrol wet backs came in by swimming the river by the hundreds?

Mr. HUDSPETH. I want to state to the gentleman that the testimony does not show that condition. It shows a condition after the border patrol was taken off, and that then the wet backs, the graybacks, and the bluebacks came across the river. That was after the border patrol was taken off. If you want the immigration law enforced, then vote for this amendment so that the border patrol can be reinstated.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. When was this border patrol reduced in number?

Mr. HUDSPETH. About a year ago, as I recall now. I will state to the gentleman from Kansas that these men in the border patrol are men who were inured to the hardships of the border, men who understood the conditions there, who could ride those trails and who knew the trails where these people were likely to come across. To-day we have men enough only at the regular stations, and that is the reason we are flooded with Japanese and Chinese.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. I do not care to raise any question of order if this is the regular patrol that is authorized by law.

Mr. HUDSPETH. It is, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. GOOD. Then I do not quite understand the purport of the gentleman's amendment. The department has all of the money necessary. What the gentleman is asking, then, is practically that the Secretary of Labor shall perform the duties prescribed by law in this respect.

Mr. HUDSPETH. What I am asking is that upon the request of the Director General of Immigration he is allowed a sufficient fund to reestablish the border patrol. He wants the authority of Congress.

Mr. GOOD. But we have a law now to that effect.

Mr. HUDSPETH. That is true.

Mr. GOOD. We appropriate money in a lump sum, and it is the duty of the Secretary of Labor to allot a sufficient amount of money to make effective that patrol.

Mr. HUDSPETH. It is to simply emphasize the matter. He could do it without this amendment if he had this money, but

it is simply emphasizing the fact that Congress desires the immigration laws of the country enforced and that men who are capable and efficient be placed down on that border of 2,000 miles.

Mr. GOOD. I assume the Secretary of Labor—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOOD. I ask that the gentleman's time be extended three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GOOD. Now, suppose the Commissioner of Immigration should ask the Secretary of Labor to allot him \$100,000 for this purpose, or any sum, and suppose the Secretary of Labor should say that it is not necessary to allot over \$25,000. Now, the expenditure of the funds being within the control of the Secretary of Labor, after all it does not seem to me that we are getting very far by the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. HUDSPETH. It does to me.

Mr. GOOD. The Secretary of Labor can then allot the amount which, in his judgment, is sufficient to bring about an effective control, and he has that right now.

Mr. HUDSPETH. We had the same law relative to custom officials, and yet my colleague from Texas a few days ago introduced a similar amendment providing sufficient funds to emphasize the fact that it is needed.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; and the gentleman's colleague virtually admitted that that did not get anywhere except to tell an official of the Government to do what the law required him to do.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I am candid to say that that is all we are telling him by this amendment—that is all—emphasizing the fact that a border patrol is needed and that he should allot sufficient funds out of the \$2,600,000 to reestablish the board of patrol to its former strength to prevent these undesirables from coming across.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I renew it. May we have the amendment again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Now, I would like to state to the gentleman from Illinois that this is not increasing this appropriation. It is simply establishing a border patrol that is authorized by law, and the testimony, as I have just read—the gentleman was not in the Chamber—by the supervising inspector is that the border there, 2,000 miles in length, is now left unprotected, so that Japanese, Chinese, and undesirable aliens are coming in at their will.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. How much will this take of this \$2,600,000?

Mr. HUDSPETH. I do not know.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. How much does the gentleman estimate that it will take of this?

Mr. HUDSPETH. The gentleman heard the testimony of Mr. Berkshire, who stated it would take about \$250,000. The gentleman remembers that testimony as well as I do.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDSPETH. I yield with pleasure to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. Would this keep Texas and Arizona from bringing over people to work on the farms?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Not at all. They bring them through the regular immigration stations. This keeps, I will say to the gentleman, these people from entering surreptitiously through these passes, through that rough country, and I do not think any gentleman here would object to it after it has been explained.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that where we make a lump-sum appropriation of this sort we should by an amendment direct a Secretary how it shall be expended. It has to be taken from somewhere else if it is to be expended here.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. HUDSPETH. The same amendment was offered by my colleague, the dean of the Texas delegation, with reference to customs officials a few days ago, and the gentleman withdrew the point of order. It was just identical—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That shows that I erred the other day and one error is not sufficient reason for two. I ought to have insisted on the point of order the other day so it would not be a precedent.

Mr. HUDSPETH. The gentleman should not be partial to an older Member as against a new Member who comes here and tries to have the laws enforced.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Well, it is not our duty to enforce the laws, it is our duty to enact the laws. I do not think it is in order to—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Well, the Secretary now has the jurisdiction. This is directing the Secretary how he shall allot the money. That is legislation, not an appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the amendment in the form in which it is now is an affirmative direction to the Secretary of Labor in respect to the use of the money appropriated by the section, that in the form in which it is now offered it is not a limitation and therefore sustains the point of order.

[Mr. JOHNSON of Washington addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's discussion ought to be made while a fuller membership is here.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If the gentleman objects, I withdraw my request.

Mr. CALDWELL. I would like to hear what the gentleman has to say.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to have a House full here or we ought to quit. I therefore make the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Fifty-nine Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ANDERSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 13870, the sundry civil appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H. R. 13590. An act granting the consent of Congress to Sid Smith, of Bonham, Tex., for the construction of a bridge across the Red River between the counties of Fannin, Tex., and Bryan, Okla.;

H. R. 13724. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Sabine River at or near Orange, Tex.; and

H. J. Res. 302. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation for the participation of the United States in the observance of the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims at Provincetown and Plymouth, Mass.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Tuesday, May 11, 1920, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. PLATT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 351) extending the provisions of an act amending section 32 of the Federal farm loan act approved July 17, 1916, to June 30, 1921, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 952), which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14021) to amend the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 953), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. PETERS, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 412) to transfer Frederick W. Cobb from the list of chief machinists, United States Navy, temporary lieutenant, United States Navy, to the list of chief pay clerks, United States Navy, temporary lieutenant, Pay Corps, United States Navy, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 954), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 1447) to correct the naval record of Fred C. Konrad, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 955), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 1743) for the relief of Matthew McDonald, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 956), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 14020) to amend public, No. 254, Sixty-fifth Congress, being an act to provide revenue, and for other purposes, and known as the revenue act of 1919, by increasing the personal exemption of the heads of families or married persons with dependent children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PLATT: A bill (H. R. 14021) to amend the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 14022) to amend chapter 213, Twenty-fourth Statutes at Large; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 14023) to amend section 3 of the act of October 6, 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRITTEN: Resolution (H. Res. 551) requesting the Secretary of War to furnish certain information to the House of Representatives regarding the West Point Military Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: Resolution (H. Res. 552) for the immediate consideration of H. R. 13931; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PLATT: Resolution (H. Res. 553) for the consideration of House joint resolution 351; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FESS: Resolution (H. Res. 554) providing for the consideration of House bill 4438; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: Resolution (H. Res. 555) providing for the printing of a study entitled "Scots and Scottish Influence in Congress" as a House document; to the Committee on Printing.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PAIGE: A bill (H. R. 14024) granting a pension to Julia A. Twichell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 14025) for the relief of Cataldo Bellanova; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 14026) granting a pension to Mary A. Flick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3534. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of New Orleans Federation of Women's Clubs, favoring the establishment of a Coast Guard station on Lake Pontchartrain at West End, New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3535. Also (by request), petition of post-office employees of North Adams, Mass., favoring the immediate enactment of the



civil-service retirement bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

3536. Also (by request), petition of North Washington Teachers' Association, Washington, D. C., favoring a bonus of not less than \$500 for teachers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3537. Also (by request), petition of Davenport Aerie, No. 235, Fraternal Order of Eagles, regarding the Rock Island Arsenal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3538. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of American Newspaper Publishers' Association, relative to second-class postage rates, Federal taxation, and Pacific radio services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3539. Also, petition of College of the City of New York Post, American Legion, opposing bonus to noninjured veterans of the war, but in favor of adjusted compensation for those injured; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3540. Also, petition of Board of Aldermen of the City of New York, relative to increased pay for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3541. By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the Board of Trade of the City of Chicago, opposing sales tax on grain or produce for future delivery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3542. Also, petition of the Disabled Men's Bureau of Service and Legislation, relative to bonus legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3543. Also, petition of Joint Postal Organization, of Boston, Mass., relative to the Postal Service and necessity of the reclassification of postal salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3544. Also, petition of American Steamship Owners' Association, favoring the granting to the Coast Guard Service the rank and pay of officers of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

3545. By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petition of Board of Aldermen of New York City, favoring action of Joint Congressional Commission on Postal Salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3546. By Mr. McDUFFIE: Petition of the adjutant general of the National Guard of the State of Alabama, urging the conferees on the Army reorganization bill to act favorably on the bill allowing the National Guard to organize under the militia clauses (State rights); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3547. Also, petition of a mass meeting of citizens of Jefferson County, Ala., favoring the freedom of Ireland and the passage of the Mason bill; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3548. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Sylvester F. Bau, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against tax on stock exchange transactions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3549. Also, petition of Joint Postal Organizations of Boston, Mass., urging a report of the Joint Commission on Postal Salaries and increased remuneration for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3550. Also, petition of the Madison Club of the eighteenth assembly district, urging an early report of the Joint Commission on the Readjustment of Salaries in the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3551. Also, petition of Robert L. Cohn, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against tax on stock-exchange transactions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3552. Also, petition of Gilbert T. Washburn & Co., protesting against legislation taxing advertising; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3553. Also, petition of Private Soldiers and Sailors' Legion, Washington, D. C., relative to bonus for soldiers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3554. By Mr. PAIGE: Papers to accompany H. R. 14024, granting a pension to Julia A. Twichell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3555. By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of Albert Firman and Andrew O. Murphy, favoring an increase in pay to postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3556. Also, petition of American Museum of Natural History, opposing passage of House bill 12466; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

3557. Also, petition of International Planters' Corporation, Private Soldiers and Sailors' Legion, Morris Land & Improvement Co., Francis S. Whitten, F. Robertson Jones, and Adolph Lewisoohn, in connection with soldier-bonus legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3558. Also, petition of American Steamship Owners' Association of New York, favoring the same pay for Coast Guard Service as the officers of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

3559. Also, petition of James C. McMullin, of New York City, regarding freedom of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3560. Also, petition of Douglas Johnson, of New York City, regarding freedom of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3561. Also, petition of J. Mitchel Thorsen, Gilbert T. Washburn & Co., and George A. Torsey, opposing the proposed tax on advertising and the proposed sales tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3562. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of the Woman's Study Club of Alamo, N. Dak., indorsing the Sheppard-Towner maternity bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3563. Also, petition of the Woman's Club of Amidon and the Woman's Study Club of Alamo, both in the State of North Dakota, indorsing the Smith-Towner educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

3564. By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of Joint Postal Organization of Boston, Mass., requesting increased pay for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

## SENATE.

TUESDAY, May 11, 1920.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, with every mention of Thy name we come to the point of the supreme choice of life. Thou dost bring us to the issue of life by the revelations of Thyself to men. We pray that as we begin the duties of this day, lifting our hearts to Thy throne, our choice may be the choice of God's will and of God's way. May we surrender ourselves fully into Thy keeping, that we may to-day guard the honor of God and advance the interests of Thy kingdom through our work. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Reading Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when on request of Mr. CURTIS, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, one of its clerks, announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2448) for the relief of certain officers of the United States Army, and for other purposes.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CAPPER presented a memorial of the Sunday School of the Church of the Brethren, of Waterloo, Iowa, remonstrating against compulsory military training and praying for the enactment of legislation providing for physical education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. HALE presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Portland, Me., praying for an increase in the salaries of postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. TOWNSEND (for Mr. NEWBERRY) presented a petition of Mason County Pomona Grange, No. 52, Patrons of Husbandry, of Ludington, Mich., and a petition of Hamlin Resort Grange, No. 1354, Patrons of Husbandry, of Ludington, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation granting to farmers the right of collective bargaining, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also (for Mr. NEWBERRY) presented a petition of Phillip Elliott Hodges Post, No. 22, American Legion, of Saginaw, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation providing adjusted compensation to ex-service men, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also (for Mr. NEWBERRY) presented a petition of the Federation of Women's Clubs, of Oakland County, Mich., and a petition of sundry citizens of Port Huron, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the public protection of maternity and infancy, which were referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 2279) to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Humboldt National Forest, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 535) thereon.